



~~E: d d:~~ .

E : s : 5.

Th. U. 227 h

(4

<36637295350011

<36637295350011

Bayer. Staatsbibliothek

REV. JOHN W. B. WILSON
REV. JOHN W. B. WILSON, D.D.

REV. JOHN W. B. WILSON, D.D.

VOLUME IV

REV. JOHN W. B. WILSON, D.D.

THE GARDEN

THE GARDEN

THE GARDEN

LONDON

THE GARDEN

THE GARDEN

THE GARDEN

THE
WHOLE
OF THE
REV. JOHN LIGHTFOOT, D.D.

MASTER OF CATHERINE HALL,

Cambridge.

EDITED BY THE
REV. JOHN ROGERS PITMAN, A.M.

Published by J. Rogers Pitman, 15, Abchurch Lane, London, E.C. 4.

Bayerische
Staatsbibliothek
München

CRUCIUM: OR MISCELLANEA:

AND

THE HARMONY

OF

THE FOUR EVANGELISTS

BY J. R. P.

LONDON:

Printed by J. Rogers Pitman, 15, Abchurch Lane, London, E.C. 4.

SOLD BY ALL BOOKSELLERS AND STATIONERS. A. C. LARKIN, 15, Abchurch Lane, London, E.C. 4. AND BY THE AUTHOR, J. ROGERS PITMAN, 15, Abchurch Lane, London, E.C. 4.

ERUBHIN; OR, MISCELLANIES:

AND THE

HARMONY

OF

THE FOUR EVANGELISTS;

PARTS I. AND II.

FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE GOSPELS


TO THE FIRST PASSOVER AFTER OUR SAVIOUR'S BAPTISM.



BY THE

REV. JOHN LIGHTFOOT, D.D.


MASTER OF CATHARINE HALL, CAMBRIDGE.



EDITED BY THE

REV. JOHN ROGERS PITMAN, A. M.

*Alternate Morning Preacher at Belgrave and Berkeley Chapels; and alternate Evening
Preacher at the Foundling and Magdalen Hospitals.*



LONDON:

PRINTED BY J. F. DOVE, ST. JOHN'S SQUARE:

SOLD BY HATCHARD AND SON, PICCADILLY; W. CLARKE, NEW BOND STREET;
RIVINGTONS, ST. PAUL'S CHURCHYARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE; BAYNES
AND SON, PATERNOSTER ROW; R. PRIESTLEY, HIGH HOLBORN; LLOYD
AND SON, HARLEY STREET; J. BOOTH, DUKE STREET, PORTLAND PLACE;
R. BAYNES, IVY LANE; J. PARKER, OXFORD; AND DEIGHTON AND SONS,
CAMBRIDGE.

MDCCCXXII.

ERRATA; OR, MISCELLANIES:

AND THE

HARMONY

OF

THE FOUR EVANGELISTS;

PARTS I. AND II.

FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE GOSPELS

TO THE FIRST PASSOVER AFTER OUR SAVIOUR'S BAPTISM.

BY THE

REV. JOHN LIGHTFOOT, D.D.

MASTER OF CATHEDRAL HALL, CAMBRIDGE.

EDITED BY THE

REV. JOHN ROGERS PITMAN, A.M.

Assistant Master of the Hospital at St. Bartholomew's, London; and formerly
Master of the Hospital at St. George's, London.

LONDON:

PRINTED BY J. T. BOW, ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

W. B. BARNARD AND SON, PICCADILLY; W. CLARK, NEW BOND STREET;
R. B. BARNARD, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD AND WATERLOO PLACE; RAYNES
AND SON, PATERNOSTER ROW; R. B. BARNARD, 11, HOLBORN; LLOYD
AND SON, MARK LANE; J. B. BARNARD, 1, BUCKINGHAM STREET; BARNARD
AND SON, 1, BARNARD STREET, LONDON; AND BARNARD AND SON,
CAMBRIDGE.

MDCCLXXII.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
ERUBHIN : or, Miscellanies, Christian and	
Judaical	1
Dedication to Sir Rowland Cotton	3
Address to the Reader	5
Index to the Erubhin	85
The Harmony of the Four Evangelists, among themselves, and with the Old Testament:	
<i>Part First</i> ; from the beginning of the Gos- pels to the Baptism of our Saviour	87—331
*Dedication to the Earl of Essex	89
Epistle to the Reader	93
Prolegomena; relative to the age of the world, at our Saviour's birth	97
The Harmony of the Four Evangelists, among themselves, and with the Old Testament:	
<i>Part the Second</i> ; from the Baptism of our Saviour to the first Passover after	333
*Dedication to the County, and Members, of Stafford	335
*Address to the Reader	339

* Omitted by Dr. Bright.

TABIE OF CONTENTS.

PAGE.	
1	Judicial
3	Dedication to Sir Rowland Cotton
5	Address to the Reader
85	Index to the Edition
	The Harmony of the Four Evangelists, among
	themselves, and with the Old Testament:
	Part First; from the beginning of the Gos-
87—331	pels to the Baptism of our Saviour
89	* Dedication to the Earl of Essex
93	Epistle to the Reader
	Prolegomena; relative to the age of the world,
97	at our Saviour's birth
	The Harmony of the Four Evangelists, among
	themselves, and with the Old Testament:
	Part the Second; from the Baptism of our
333	Saviour to the first Passover after
	* Dedication to the County, and Members, of
335	Stafford
339	* Address to the Reader

TO THE
RIGHT WORSHIPFUL, RIGHT REVEREND
AND
RIGHT VIRTUOUS KNIGHT,
SIR ROWLAND COTTON.

I L. WISHETH ALL PRESENT AND FUTURE JOINTURES

Even Honours.

ERUBHIN:

OR,

Miscellanies,

CHRISTIAN AND JUDAICAL,

AND OTHERS.

PENNED FOR

RECREATION AT VACANT HOURS.

ERUBHIN:

THESE

CHRISTIAN AND JUDAIC

AND OTHERS

LEARNED FOR

RECREATION AT VACANT HOURS

TO THE
RIGHT WORSHIPFUL, RIGHT LEARNED,
AND
RIGHT VIRTUOUS KNIGHT,
SIR ROWLAND COTTON,
J. L. WISHETH ALL PRESENT AND FUTURE FELICITY.

EVER HONOURED,

My creeping and weak studies, neither able to go, nor speak for themselves, do (like Pyrrhus in Plutarch), in silence, crave your tuition. For they desire, when they now come to light, to refuge to you, who, next to God, first gave them life. Your encouragement and incitation did first set me forward to the culture of holy tongues ; and here I offer you the first fruits of my barren harvest. Your tried learning and tried love assure me, that you both can judge soundly, and yet, withal, will not judge too heavily, of my weak endeavours ; and such a patron my book desireth. This hath caused, to you, this present trouble,—and, in me, this present boldness. I know it had been more secure to have been obscure, and not to have come thus to public hazard ; for, as the Roman said well, “ It is hard, when the world shall show me mine infirmities under mine own hand :” yet have I some reason, to manifest myself thus openly to the view of all. Some there be, that have hardly censured of me for idleness and sloth (as they make it) ; because (it seems) I intrude not every moment into the supply of other men’s ministries ; since it hath not yet pleased God, to prefer and promote me to a charge of mine own. I know well, the saying of the apostle^a belongs to all

^a Rom. i. 14.

ministers, “ To Greeks and barbarians, to the wise and foolish, they are all debtors ;” and (as the Syrian^b adds) ‘ leakrez,’ they are ‘ debtors to preach.’ And whoso is necessarily called, and refuseth,—is as bad as the false prophets were, that would run before they were sent ; nay, he may seem rather worse, that, when he is sent, will not go. From this censure how far I am free, my conscience tells me ; though I must confess, that I am not so hasty, as many be, to intrude myself, where is no necessity. This hath, among some, purchased me the scar of slothfulness : to vindicate which, I have here ventured, as children do, to shoot another arrow, to find one that is lost : so have I hazarded my credit one way, to save it another. I know mine own weakness, and that this my pains, to scholars, may seem but idle : yet had I rather undergo any censure, than the blot of the other idleness, the begetter of all evil,—and of unthankfulness, the hinderer of all good. This is the cause, that brings me to a book,—and my book to you : that, by the one, I may testify to the world, that I love not to be idle,—and, by the other, witness to you, that I love not to be unthankful. Accept, I beseech you, of so small a present, and so troublesome a thankfulness ; and, what I want in tongue and effect, I will answer in desire and affection : suing always to the throne of grace, for the present prosperity of yourself and your noble lady, and the future felicity of you both hereafter.

Yours, devoted in all service,

JOHN LIGHTFOOT.

From my study at Hornsey, near
London, *March 5, 1629.*

^b The Syrian, to that verse, adds a word, which may well serve for a comment, —‘ mehhaieb euo leakrez,’ ‘ I am a debtor,’ or, ‘ I ought to preach.’

TO THE READER.

COURTEOUS READER (for such a one I wish or none),

I MAY well say of writing books, as the wise Greek did of marriage; "For a young man it is too soon; and, with an old man, his time is out." Yet have I ventured, in youth, to become public, as if I were afraid, that men would not take notice of my weakness and unlearnedness soon enough. If I fall far short of a scholar (as I know I do), my youth might have some plea, but that mine attempt can have no excuse but thy charity. To that I rather submit myself than to thy censure. I have here brought home with me, some gleanings of my more serious studies, which I offer to thee, not so much for thy instruction, as for thy harmless recreation. I bear in mind with me, the saying of Rabbi Jose Bar Jehudah^a: "He that learns of young men, is like a man that eats unripe grapes, or that drinks wine out of the wine-press: but he that learneth of the ancient, is like a man that eateth ripe grapes, and drinketh wine that is old." For fear thy teeth should be set on edge, I have brought some variety. I have not kept any method; for then I should not answer my title of 'Miscellanies.' I have, upon some things, been more copious than other; and (as Rab. Salomon observes of Ruth) I have sometime but stood to glean, and sometime sitten down. I hope thou wilt not censure me for Judaizing, though I cite them; for it is but (as the musician in Plutarch did) setting a discord first, that you may better judge of the concert; and, seeing error, you may the more embrace the truth. If this my youthful attempt shall provoke any one, that is young, to emulation in the holy tongues, I shall think I have gained. Adjourn thy severe censure, till either future

^a In Pirke Aboth.

silence, or some second attempt, either lose all, or make some satisfaction. For the present, “ Quisquis hæc legit, ubi pariter certus est, pergat mecum; ubi pariter hæsitat, quærat mecum; ubi errorem suum cognoscit, redeat ad me; ubi meum, revocet me^b.”

Thine, ready and willing,

but unable,

J. LIGHTFOOT.

^b Aug. de Trinit. lib. 1. cap. 3.

MISCELLANIES.

CHAP. I.

Of Knowledge of God.

“OMNE tempus te puta perdidisse,” &c. saith one; “All time is lost, that is not spent in thinking of God.” To be full of thoughts of him, is a lawful and holy prodigality; and to spend time in such meditations, a gainful lavishing. For this end were the Scriptures given, to lead us to meditate of God, “by meditating in them day and night^a.” Herein those fail, that never think of God at all: and those, also, that think not of him aright. The prophet makes this the mark of wicked men, that “God is not in all their thoughts:” that, like the Jews, they murder (Zachariah) the remembrance of God, even between the temple and the altar.

Commendable, in some sort, was the devotion of the philosopher, that, in so many years, spoke more with the gods than with men. Had his religion been towards the true God, what could have been asked of him more? I would Christians’ hearts were so retired towards their Creator,—that so he, that made the heart, might have it.

The heathens thought there was a God; but knew not what to think of him. They prayed and sacrificed, and kept a stir to something; but they might well have marked their churches, altars, and prayer, with the Athenian altar motto, Ἀγνώστῳ Θεῷ, “To the unknown God^b.”

Plato attained to the thought of one only God: the Persians thought he could not be comprehended in a temple: and Numa thought, he could not be represented by an image: and for this (saith Clem.^c Alex.) he was helped by Moses:—yet came all these far short of the knowledge of God. Nature, when she had brought them thus far, was come to a ‘non ultra,’ and could go no farther. Happy,

^a Psal. i. 2.

^b Acts, xvii.

^c Νούμας ἐκ τῶν Μωσέως ὠφεληθεὶς διενώληεν ἀνθρωποειδῆ, &c. Strom. 1. p. 131.

then, are we, if we could but right prize our happiness, to whom “the Day-spring from on high hath risen, and the Sun of righteousness, with healing in his wings;” upon whom the noontide of the gospel shineth, and the knowledge of God in its strength. Even so, O Lord, let it be still told in Gath, and published in the streets of Ascalon, to the rancour and sorrow of the uncircumcised, that God is known in Britain, and his name is great in England.

CHAP. II.

Of the Names of God, used by Jews and Gentiles.

“No nation so barbarous (saith Tully), that hath not some tincture of knowledge, that there is a Deity.” And yet many, nay, most people of the world, fall short of the right apprehension of God, through three reasons:—First^d; When they cannot carry their minds farther than their senses; and so think God hath a body, as they have,—that is coloured, &c. Secondly; When they measure God by themselves, and so make him passionate, like man. “For men, not able to conceive what God is, what his nature, what his power, &c. fall into such opinions, that they frame gods of themselves: and as is their own human nature, so they attribute to God the like, for his will, actions, and intentions,” saith Arnobius^e. Thirdly; When they mount above nature and sense, and yet not right, feigning that God begat himself, &c. Hence came the multitude and diversity of deities among the heathen, minting thousands of gods to find the right, and yet they could not. Hence their many names, and many fables^f, made by them,—that it seems, they thought it as lawful to make gods, as it was for God to make them.

At first, they worshipped these their deities without any representation, only by their names: Coelites, Inferi, Heroes, Sumani, Sanguis, and thousands others,—the naming of which, is more like conjuring than otherwise. Nature itself taught men, there was something they must acknowledge for supreme superintendent of all things. This light of nature, led them to worship something; but it could not bring them to worship aright. Hence, some adored brute beasts,—some, trees,—some, stars,—some, men,—some, devils. Some by

^d Aug. de Trin. lib. 1. cap. 1.

^e Adv. Gent. lib. 7.

^f “Hinc plurima eorum nomina, et multiplex descriptio apud eos occurrit,” &c. Leusden.

images, some without,—some in temples, some without. Thus was Gideon's fleece, the heathen piece of the world all dry, set in the darkness of the shadow of death: but “in Jewry was God known, and his name great in Israel.” By his name ‘Jehovah’ he expressed himself, when he brought them from Egypt, and his glory he pitched among them. They knew him by his names and titles of Elohim, Adonai, El, Shaddai, Elion, and his great name, Jehovah, as the Jews do call it. There the Scriptures of the law and prophets did teach them; yet they, thus nearly acquainted with the true God, forsook him, “so that wrath came upon Israel.”

The Rabbinical Jews, beside Scripture-words, have divers phrases to express God by in their writings. As frequently they call him ‘Hakkadhosh baruch hu,’ “the holy blessed He;” in short, with four letters, *הק"ב*. Sometime they use ‘El jithbarech,’ “the Lord, who is,” or “be blessed.” Sometimes ‘Shamaiim,’ ‘Heaven,’—by a metonymy, because there he dwelleth. The like phrase is in the gospel, “Father, I have sinned against Heaven^s.” The like phrase is frequent in England, “The heavens keep you.”—‘Shekinah’ they use for a title of God, but more especially for the Holy Ghost. So saith Elias Levita in Tisbi: “Our Rabbins, of happy memory, call the Holy Ghost ‘Shekinah,’ gⁿal shem shehu shaken gⁿal hannebhiim, because he dwells upon the prophets.” Accordingly saith our Nicene creed, “I believe in the Holy Ghost, who spake by the prophets.” ‘Shem,’ ‘a name,’ or ‘the name,’ they use for a name of God; and ‘Makom,’ ‘a place,’ they place for the same, because he comprehendeth all things, and nothing comprehendeth him. ‘Gebhurah,’ ‘strength,’ is in the same use. They are nice in the utterance of the name ‘Jehovah:’ but use divers paraphrases for it; “Shem shel arbang,” “the name of four letters;” “Shem haminhhad,” “the proper name;” and others. One in Eusebius hath eloquently expressed it thus:

Ἑπτὰ με φωνήεντα θεὸν μέγαν ἄφθιτον αἰνεῖ
Γράμματα, τῶν πάντων ἀνάματον πατέρα.
Εἰμὶ δ' ἐγὼ πάντων χέλυς ἄφθιτος, ἧ τὰ λυράδι
Ἡρμοσάμην δίνης οὐρανίου μέλη.

Seven sounding letters ring the praise of me,
Th' immortal God, th' Almighty Deity:
The Father of all, that cannot weary be.

I am th' eternal Viol of all things,
Where the melody so sweetly rings
Of heaven's music, which so sweetly sings.

What these seven letters are, that do thus express God, is easy to guess, that they be the letters of the name Jehovah; which, indeed, consisteth but of four letters, but the vowels must make up the number. Of the exposition of this name 'Jehovah,' thus saith Rabbi Solomon upon these words, "I appeared to them by the name of God Omnipotent, but by my name Jehovah, I am not known to them^h;"—"He saith unto him (saith the Rabbin), I am Jehovah, faithful in rendering a good reward, to those that walk before me: and I have not sent thee for nothing, but for the establishing of my words, which I spake to their fathers. And, in this sense, we find the word 'Jehovah' expounded in sundry places; 'I am Jehovah, faithful in avenging,' when he speaks of punishing; as, 'And if thou profane the name of thy God, I am Jehovah.'—And so, when he speaketh of the performing of the commandments; as, 'And you shall keep my commandments and do them, I am Jehovah, faithful to give to you a good reward:'"—thus far the Rabbin.

The Alchymistical Cabalists, or Cabalistical Alchymists, have extracted the name קפּו or number, whether you will,—out of the word Jehovah, after a strange manner. This is their way to do it:—

ופעמים י"ק הפעמים ה כה"ה הרי קכה"
ופעמים ו' לו"ה הרי קסא הפעמים ה' כ"ה
הרי קפּו

Which great mystery is, in English, thus: "Ten times ten is a hundred; five times five is twenty-five; behold 125: six times six is thirty-six; behold 161: and five times five is twenty-five; behold קפּו, or 186." Thus runneth their senseless multiplication, multiplying numberless follies in their foolish numbers;—making conjectures, like sibyls' leaves, that, when they come to blast of trial, prove but wind. Ire-næus hath such a mystical stir about the name Jesu: which, I must needs confess, I can make nothing at all of; yet will I set down his words, that the reader may scan what I cannot. "Nomen Jesu (saith he) secundum propriam Hebræorum linguam," &c. "The name Jesu, according to the

^h Exod. vi. 3.

proper speech of the Hebrews, consisteth of two letters and a half, as the skilful amongst them say: signifying, the Lord, which containeth heaven and earth: for 'Jesu,' according to the old Hebrew, signifieth 'heaven,' and the earth is called 'Sura usser.'" Thus that father, in his second book against Heretics, cap. 41: on which words I can critic, only with deep silence. Only, for his two letters and a half, I take his meaning to be according to the Jews' writing of the name Jesu, ישו, who deny him the last letter of his name ך, because they deny him for a Saviour. So the Dutch Jew, Elias Levita, saith, in express words: "The Christians say, that their Messiah was called ישוע, by the commandment of the angel Gabriel, because he should save all the world from Gehinnom; but because the Jews do not confess, that he is a Saviour, therefore they will not call him ישוע; but they leave ך, the last letter, out, and call him ישו." After this kind of writing, as Irenæus saith, the word consisteth of two letters, ש, and half a letter, that is, ך; which may be so called, because it is so little.

The Chaldee writes the name of God, with two *Yods* above, and a vowel under, thus, ܕܠܐ. From hence, some have picked an expression of the Trinity; in the two letters, the Father and the Son,—and in the vowel, the Holy Ghost, proceeding from both: and, from the equidistance of the letters and vowel, they gather the distinction of the persons; and, by the nearness of all, the unity of essence. Such another conceit hath Bonfinius, in his Hungarian history:—"When the heresy of Arius (saith he) had got head almost over all the world, and was dilated, as well by persecution as by disputation: a town in Gaul was besieged, because it held the orthodox faith of the Son's co-equality with the Father. God, to confirm this their faith, showed this miracle: As the priest was at high mass at the altar, behold, three drops of blood fell from heaven upon the altar; lying a while in an equal distance one from another, to show the distinction of the three persons; at last, in sight of all the people, they met together, to show the unity of essence;" so the story. But we have a more sure word of prophecy: "That there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit; and these three are one."

The Chaldee sometimes useth the word ܕܠܐ and ܕܠܐ, 'fear' or 'terror,' for God; because of the fear, that is due to

him. So Jacob, coming from Syria, and being to swear to a Syrian, swears according to the Syrian or Chaldee phrase, "By the fear of his father Isaac^h;" or, "By the God that Isaac feared:" as Onkelos and Jonathan render it.

CHAP. III.

Of the Phrase, 'The Sons of God,' Gen. vi, and Job i.

ALL take this phrase in Job, to mean 'the angels,' and truly: in which sense, while they have taken it in the sixth of Genesis, they spoil all: for hence they think, that angels lay with women, and begat children. So can Jarchi almost find in his heart to think; and so Tertullian, Lactantius, and others. Some tell, what evil arts these angels taught women, and how they begat mighty children of them. How far this conceit is from true philosophy, let Aristotle censure. Merlin, in Geoffry Monmouth, is recorded to be such another hatch; believe it who list. His vein of prophesying can make Alanus de Insulis think it so; but, I must needs confess, it comes not into my creed. As some conceit that the fallen angels, or devils, here begat children of women,—so the Jews most wickedly fable, that Adam begat children of devils. "Those hundred and thirty years (say they) that Adam was separated from Eve, devils came to him, and he engendered with them, and begat devils, and spirits, and fiends." And again; "Four women are the mothers of Shedhim, or devils, Lilith, Naamah, Ogereth, and Mahlath." I believe both these alike; for I believe that neither is likely. Both the Chal-dees, Onkelos, and Jonathan, render the 'sons of Elohim,' the 'sons of the potentates, or judges,' taking the word 'Elohim,' in the same sense that it is taken in the middlemost verse of the Book of Exodusⁱ; "Thou shalt not curse Elohim," or, "the judges." This opinion is far better than the former; but Christians have a better than this:—That the house and progeny of holy Seth, are the sons of God, or the church; and the brood of Cain's females, were the daughters of men. Cypriano di Valera, in his Spanish translation of Gen. iv, and the last verse, translates it thus; "Entonces comenzaron llamarse:" "Then begun men to be called by the name of God," or, "by the name of the Lord:" and in the margin he explains himself thus; that 'then the men of

^h Gen. xxxi. 53.

ⁱ Chap. xxii. 28.

Seth's house began to be a public church, and to be distinguished from Cain's family, and to be called the sons of God^j.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Phrase, 'Son of Man.'

THIS phrase is frequent in Scripture, and Rabbin Hebrew, but most frequent in Chaldee and Syrian: 'Bene Anasha,' and 'Bar nosho.' In the latter of which, the Syrian usually writeth אנשא, but leaveth out the first letter: as that tongue doth frequently, in other words, use the like ellipsis, writing not as they read; as it is said of the French. Ezekiel, in his prophecy, in Scripture Hebrew, is frequently called 'Son of man.' Why so often he, and no other prophet, should be so styled, reasons are given by divers: to me (though far inferior to all them) the ground-work seemeth to be,—because his prophecy was written in Chaldean captivity, he useth the Chaldean phrase, 'Son of man,' that is, 'O man.' The same phrase Daniel useth in Chaldea^k.

CHAP. V.

Of Japheth's Plantation by his Son, Javan.

JAVAN is generally held to be Greece. And the Greek tongue is, by all Hebrews, called, the speech of Javan. The Arabians do so style the same language. The Syrian, in Romans the first chapter, verse 16, calls the Grecians ארמ'א; upon what reason, I cannot imagine. Javan, the son of Japheth, is held to have planted or peopled this country; in memory of whose name, the Iones are famous monuments. Moses saith, he had four sons, Elisha, Tarshish, Kittim, and Dodanim: which, it is likely, planted all the country of Greece, as far as into Italy. Elisha and Dodanim dwelt, at first, near together, and so did Tarshish and Kittim; but their posterity scattered far and near. The Jerusalem and Babylon Targums do almost resolve us of these four men's plantations: for Jonathan reads the fourth verse of the tenth of Genesis, thus; "And the sons of Javan, Elisha, Elis, Tarsus, Acacia, and Dardania." Jeruselamy, thus: "And the sons of Javan, Elisha, and the names of their provinces, Alastarasom and Dodonia." Which last word, 'Alastarasom,' I take to be mistaken, by joining two words together, and missing

^j Gen. vi. 2.^k Dan. x. 16.

the last letter ד *Mem*, for ד *Samech*; which is easily done, they be so like. The word 'Alastarasom' should, without doubt, be 'Alas' or 'Elis Tarsus.' Elis, frequent in all authors: Eilision^l, Eleusine^m, are places in Greece, bearing the name of their old planter, Elisha. Dodanim is registered in the name of old Dodona. Tarshish left a memorial of himself in Cilicia, in the city of Tarsus: which was, as Pliny saith, 'urbs liberaⁿ,' a free city; and St. Paul is free of that city^o.

Tarshish, in Gen. x, is the name of a man; in Jonah i. 3, in Chaldean paraphrase, it is used for the sea; in Exod. xxviii, for a pearl^p; in Acts xxii, the name of a town. I think, I may safely suppose, that the town took the name from the man, the sea from the town, and the pearl from the sea.

Kittim got into the isle Cyprus, near his brother Tarshish: from him, that island, in old time, was called 'Cethin,' as Ant. di Guevara nameth it, in 'Horologio Principum.' And the men of Cyprus acknowledged 'Cythnon quendam,' 'one Cythnus' (or Kittim) for their predecessor, as saith Herodotus^q. That island set out colonies farther, to replenish the western world: who bare the memory and name of their father Kittim with them all along, as they went. Macedon, or Macetia, is called Chettiim^r. At last, they arrived in Italy, which is called Chittim^s, and so rendered by the Chaldees. Thus, Javan's posterity grew great in Greece and Italy; and, at last, sent us men over into these isles of the Gentiles.

CHAP. VI.

Of Jewish Learning.

THE Jews' chief studies are about the Scriptures, or about the Hebrew tongue, but some have dealt in other matters. Their tongue is their chief learning; which is, indeed, the ground of all sacred knowledge. In it, some are most ignorant, and some again as accurate. They value it so highly, that the mistaking of a letter in it, say they, destroys the world. He that, in this verse^t, 'En kadosh caiovah,' readeth

^l In Homer in *Bæot*.

^m In Plutarch in *Theseo*.

ⁿ Nat. Hist. lib. 5.

^o Acts, xxii.

^p The pearl Tarshish, in Exod. xxviii. 20, is rendered, in English, a 'beryl:' in the Chaldee translations, it is 'kermum iamma,' 'a pearl of the sea:' Pliny speaks of 'keramides,' a pearl near that name, Terus. Targum thinks Tarshish was Asher's stone; but Jonathan, that it was Zebulun's; and more likely; for a pearl of the sea is not unfit for Zebulun, a dweller by the sea, Gen. xlix. 13.

^q Lib. 7.

^r 1 Mac. i. 1.

^s Num. xxiv. 24.

^t אין קדוש כיהוה אין קדוש ביהוה

Beth for *Caph*, makes it, “there is no holiness in Jehovah, and destroyeth the world.” He that will, may see most copious work of this nicety in Tanch. on Gen. i. How nimble textualists and grammarians, for the tongue, the Rabbins are, their comments can witness. But as, in Chaucer, “the greatest clerks are not the wisest men,”—so, among them, these that are so great textualists, are not best at the text. In human arts, some of them have practised: Kimchi and Levita for grammar; Rabbi Simeon for logic; and others in other things,—as Buxtorfius, in his collection of Jewish authors, will fully satisfy.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Talmud.

Whoso nameth the Talmud, nameth all Judaism,—and whoso nameth Misna, and Gemara, he nameth all the Talmud: and so saith Levita, ‘Hattalmud nehhlak,’ &c. “The Talmud is divided into two parts; the one part is called ‘Misna,’ and the other part is called ‘Gemara;’ and these two together, are called ‘the Talmud.’” This is the Jews’ council of Trent;—the foundation and ground-work of their religion. For they believe the Scripture, as the Talmud believes; for they hold them of equal authority: “Rabbi Tanchum, the son of Hamlai, saith, Let a man always part his life into three parts: a third part for the Scriptures, a third part for Misna, and a third part for Gemara.” Two for one,—two parts for the Talmud for one for the Scripture. So highly do they, Papist-like, prize the vain traditions of men. This great library of the Jews is much alike such another work upon the Old Testament, as Thomas Aquinas’s ‘Catena Aurea’ is upon the New. For this is the sum of all their doctors’ conceits and descants upon the law, as his is a collection of all the fathers’ explications and comments upon the Gospels. For matter, it is much like Origen’s books of old, “ubi bene, nemo melius,” &c; where they write well, none better,—and where ill, none worse.

The word ‘Talmud’ is the same in Hebrew, that ‘doctrine’^u is in Latin, and ‘doctrinal’ in our usual speech. It is (say the Jews) a commentary upon the written law of God. And both the law and this (say they), God gave to Moses; the

^u Elias Lev. in Tisbi.

law by day, and by writing,—and this, by night, and by word of mouth. The law was kept by writing still,—this still by tradition. Hence comes the distinction so frequent in Rabbins, of “Torah she baccatubh,” and “Torah she begnal peh,” “the law in writing, and the law that comes by word of mouth:” “Moses” (say they) received the law from Sinai,—(this traditional law, I think they mean,) “and delivered it to Joshua, Joshua to the elders, the elders to the prophets, and the prophets to the men of the great synagogue.” And thus, like Fame in Virgil, ‘crevit eundo,’—like a snow-ball, it grew bigger with going. Thus do they father their fooleries upon Moses, and elders, and prophets, who (good men) never thought of such fancies; as the Romanists, for their traditions, can find books of Clemens, Dionysius, and others, who never dreamed of such matters. Against this their traditional, our Saviour makes part of his sermon in the mount, Matt. v. But he touched the Jews’ freehold, when he touched their Talmud; for greater treasure in their conceits they had none: like Cleopatra in Plutarch, making much of the viper, that destroyed them.

CHAP. VIII.

Talmudism.

To omit the time when it was written, and the distinction of Jerusalem and Babylon Talmud; the chief end of them both (as they think), is to explain the Old Testament. The titles of the books show their intents:—Pesachim, about the Passover; Sanhedrim, about the high courts; Beracoth, about thanksgiving. Sometime they comment, sometime they allude, sometime controvert, sometime fable. For this book contains their common law and civil, and commonly some things above all law and civility. To instance in one or two,—that, by Hercules’ foot, ye may guess his body.

Judges ix. 13, it is said by the vine, “Shall I leave my wine, which cheereth God and man? How doth wine cheer God?” Rabbi Akibah saith, “Because men give God thanks for it.”

There also they question, or controvert, “Whether a man should give thanks, or say grace, for his meat and drink, before he taste it?”

And otherwise; “Whether a man may bless God for the sweet smell of incense, which he smells offered to idols?”

“Whether a man may light a candle at another candle, that burns in a candlestick that hath images on it?”

“Whether a man, at his devotions, if a serpent come and bite him by the heel, may turn and stoop to shake her off, or no?” Which question Rabbi Tanchum answers very profoundly, that “they must not so much as shake the foot to get a serpent off;” and gives a huge strong reason; “For (saith he) such a one was praying, and a serpent comes and catcheth him by the heel: he holds on his devotion, and stirs not; and presently the snake falls away stark dead, and the man not hurt.” ‘Legenda Aurea’ hath not the art of this coining beyond them.

For their allusions, take a piece out of the book Mincha, which I have transcribed and translated into our own tongue, full of true Talmudism:—

“Our Rabbins teach, Israel is beloved, because God hath favoured them with the commandment of phylacteries, upon their heads and upon their arms, fringes upon their garments, and marks upon their doors. And concerning them, David saith, ‘Seven times a day do I praise thee, because of thy righteous judgments.’ At the time that David went into the bath, and saw himself stand naked, he said, ‘Woe is me, that I stand naked without the commandment^w;’ but when he remembered the circumcision in his flesh, his mind was at quiet. Afterward, when he went out, he made a song of it, as it is said, ‘To him that excelleth upon Sheminith (or an eighth); a Psalm of David:’ because of the circumcision, that was given on the eighth day. Rabbi Eliezer, the son of Jacob, saith, Whosoever hath phylacteries upon his head, and phylacteries upon his arm, and fringes upon his garments, and a mark on his door,—all this will keep^x him from sinning; as it is written, ‘A threefold cord is not easily broken.’ And he saith, The angel of the Lord pitcheth round about those, that fear him, to deliver them,” &c. ‘Qui Bavium non odit, amet,’ &c.

^w Heb. Mitsuah, or ‘without my phylacteries.’

^x From this conceit it appears they were called phylacteries; that is, ‘keepers.’

CHAP. IX.

Of the Cabalists.

THESE should be men of great account, for their trading is chiefly in numbers: but the effects of their studies prove but fetches ‘nullius numeri,’ of no reckoning. Their strange tricks and sleights of invention, how to pick out a matter of nothing, out of a thing of no matter, is so intricate, that I do not much care, if into these secrets my soul do not come. Their Atbash is a strange crotchet beyond the moon: it is described by the great Buxtorfius, in his ‘Abbreviaturæ.’

Their Rashe and Sophe tebhoth, their Notericon and Geometria, whether to call them Cabalistical, Masoretical, or fantastical, I know not:—they have paid the margin of the Bible with such conceits. I could give examples by hundreds; but it were but $\Delta\omega\rho\omicron\nu$ ἄδωρον, a present worse than none at all.

CHAP. X.

Gideon's Army. Josh. vii.

GIDEON'S army represents the church visible and invisible: for as, in his army, all the company marched alike, and used the same military discipline, and yet two-and-twenty thousand were cowards, and returned from him for fear, at the well Harod; which, it may be, was called Harod, or fear, from their fearfulness;—so, in the church visible, men use the same word, the same sacraments, and the same outward profession, yet are many of them but cowards in Christ's warfare, when it comes to the trial. Gideon's trial of his soldiers, by lapping water, and kneeling to drink, was a good piece of military discipline: for those that lapped in their hands, showed their nimbleness in march, who could drink and not stay; but those that kneeled down, made a stop in their marching.

Gideon's fight is much like Jericho's siege,—that with trumpets, this with trumpets and lamps: his conquest like Abraham's,—with three hundred men he overthrows an army, as Abraham did with three hundred and eighteen. St. Austin keeps a deplorable stir about allegorizing this number, three hundred, by the Greek letter T, to make it resemble the sign of the cross: and so he runs both besides the

language and the matter: charity to the good man makes me ambiguous and doubtful, whether that fancy be his or not.

CHAP. XI.

A Jerusalem Tenet, ex Kimchio in Præfat. to the Small Prophets.

“OUR rabbins, of happy memory, say (saith he), That every prophet, whose name and his father’s name is set down in his prophecy, it is certain that he was a prophet, and the son of a prophet. He whose name, and not his father’s name, it is certain that he was a prophet, and not the son of a prophet. He whose name and the name of his city is set down, it is certain that he was of that city. He whose name, and not the name of his city, it is certain that he was a prophet of Jerusalem. And they say, That he whose father and father’s father’s name is set down in his prophecy, was a greater man of parentage, than he whose father is only named. As in Zephaniah, i. 1.”

CHAP. XII.

Nun inversum. Num. x. and xi.

IN the tenth of Numbers, and the thirty-fifth verse, in these words, וַיֵּהָיֶה בְּנִסּוּעַ הָאָרֶץ “And when the ark went forward,” the letter Nun is written wrong way, or turned back, thus,—ן, “to show (say the Hebrews), the loving turning of God to the people.” And in the eleventh chapter, and first verse, in these words, וַיֵּהָיֶה הָעָם כְּמִתְאַנְּנִים “And the people became as murmurers,” &c; the letter Nun is again written wrong, or turned back, thus,—ן, “to show (say they), the perverse turning of the people from God:” and thus are these two places written in every true Bible in the world. If the Jews do not here give any one satisfaction, yet do they (as Erasmus speaks of Origen) set students on work to look for that, which, else, they would scarce have sought for. Such strange passages as these, in writing some words in the Bible out of ordinary way (as, some letters above the word, some letters less, and some bigger than other), observed constantly by all copies and books, cannot sure be for nothing: if they show nothing else, yet this they show us,—that the text is punctually kept, and not decayed; when these things (that, to a hasty, ignorant beholder, might seem errors) are thus precisely observed in all Bibles.

CHAP. XIII.

Of the Masorites.

THESE men are held to be the authors of the vowels and accents: which opinion, received by some (and those no ordinary men neither), I must needs confess, I am not so fully satisfied for, as to believe it. I do, indeed, admire the Masorites' pains, in observation of them in the Bible; but I cannot guess by that, that they have done more than observed: when a word, either in letter or vowel, goes from ordinary rules of grammar, they have marked, that it does so; which a mean Hebrician may do; but why it does so, there is either a right Jewish reason, or none at all, given. To exemplify in one; the word כִּדְרֵלְעָמֶר is so strangely pricked, that one cannot pass it: I myself observed it, before ever I saw the Masoreth: and when I came thither to them for a reason, they have done no more but observed it; viz. 'Tebhah hha-tha,' &c. that Kametz is written with two Shevaes: and so, of others, they seldom say more. Admirable is their pains, to prove the text uncorrupt, against a gainsaying Papist. For they have summed up all the letters in the Bible to show, that one hair of that sacred head is not perished. Eight hundred eight-and-forty marginal notes are observed and preserved, for the more facility of the text: the middle verse of every book noted; the number of the verses in every book reckoned: and (as I said before) not a vowel, that misseth ordinary grammar, which is not marked. So that, if we had no other surety for the truth of the Old Testament text, these men's pains, methinks, should be enough to stop the mouth of a daring Papist.

CHAP. XIV.

Of the marginal Readings.

THAT the margin should so often help the text (as I may so say), as in eight hundred and forty-eight places, may seem to tax the text of so many errors. But the learned can find a reason, why it is so. I hope, I may satisfy myself without any hurt, with this reason, till my learning will afford me a better: namely, that when they took in hand to review the Bible, after the captivity (as all hold Ezra did), that they did

it by more copies than one: which when they thus varied, they would not forsake, either because they were loath to add or diminish: therefore, they took even their varying, one in the text, and the other in the margin. Yet do I not think it was done only thus, without some more special matter in some places: for the writing of נערה so often נער does make me think (if I had nothing else to persuade me), that these marginals are not only human corrections.

CHAP. XV.

Ex Kimchio in Jonah i.

KIMCHI, questioning why the Book of Jonah should be canonical, &c. gives one most comfortable reason, which, upon reading, I could not but muse on. His words are observable, and they are these: "It is questionable, why this prophecy is written among the Holy Scriptures, since it is all against Nineveh, which was heathenish: and in it there is no remembrance (or mention) of Israel; and, among all the prophets besides this, there is not the like. But we may expound it, that it is written to be a check^z to Israel; for lo, a strange people, which was not of Israel, was ready to repent: and even the first time that a prophet reproved them, they turned wholly from their evil. But Israel, whom the prophets reproved early and late, yet they returned not from their evil. Again (this book was written), to show the great miracle, that the blessed God did with the prophet, who was three days and three nights in the belly of the fish, and yet lived, and the fish cast him up again. Again, to teach us, that the blessed God showeth mercy to the repentant of what nation soever, and pardons them, though they be many."—Hæc Kimchi.—Upon whose last words, I cannot but enter into these thoughts: Could we look for truth from a Jew, or comfort from a Spaniard? And yet, here the Spanish Jew affords us both: comfortable truth, and true comfort. 'God will pardon the repentant,'—there is a comfortable truth; 'and he will pardon them of what nation soever, if they repent,'—there is most true comfort.—When a Jew thus preaches repentance, I cannot but hearken, and help him a little out with his sermon: That as God is ready to forgive

^z Hebr. Musar. Instruction.

the repentant, of what nation soever,—so, for what sins soever, if they be truly repented. Here, I except the unpardonable sin, the sin against the Holy Ghost : which what it is, the Scripture conceals in close words, partly, because we should not despair, if we fall ourselves ;—and partly, because we should not censure damnably of our brethren, if they fall into a sin that is nigh this, so that not into it. To maintain the Jew's words and mine own, for pardon of nations and of sins, I have as large a field, as all the countries, and all the sins of the world, to look over. I will only, for countries, confine myself to Nineveh,—and, for sins, to Mary Magdalen. Nineveh, a heathen town, built by a wicked brood, inhabited by a wicked crew ;—yet, repenting Nineveh is pardoned : Mary Magdalen, a manifold sinner, a customary sinner, a most deadly sinner ; yet, repenting Mary Magdalen is forgiven.—The Jew brings me into two Christian meditations about Nineveh, or into two wholesome passions : fear and hope. God sees the sins of Nineveh ; then I know, mine are not hid : this breeds in me fear of punishment. But God forgives the sins of Nineveh ; then I hope, mine are not unpardonable : this breeds hope of forgiveness. “ Col debharausha amar lehareang libhne Adam (saith the Rabbin), bithnai im lo jashubhu : ” “ All the evils that God threatens to men, are threatened with this condition,—if they do not repent.” As before the Jew spake comfort and truth, so here he links comfort and terror. God threatens evil ; there is terror ;—but it is with condition ; there is comfort. Nineveh finds both in the story. “ Forty days, and Nineveh shall be destroyed ; ” there is a threatened terror :—“ but the Lord repented of the evil, that he spake to do unto them, and did it not ; ” there is a comforting condition. So that, as David does, so will I hopefully, and yet fearfully, sing of mercy and judgment : first mercy, then judgment :—mercy upon my repentance, lest I be cast down ; and judgment upon my sins, lest I be lifted up : mercy in judgment, and judgment in mercy. Is there any one that desperately rejects Nineveh's exhibited mercy ? let him fear Nineveh's threatened judgment. Or is there any that trembles at Nineveh's threatened judgment ? let him comfort himself by Nineveh's obtaining mercy. But, in the mouth of two witnesses, let the mercy be confirmed. Let me take Mary Magdalen with Nineveh ; and, as I see in it the forgiveness of a multitude of sinners,

—so I may see in her, of a multitude of sins : those many sinners pardoned as one man ; those many sins made as none at all. St. Bernard, speaking of her washing of Christ's feet, says, "She came thither a sinner ; but she went thence a saint : she came thither an Æthiop and a leopard ; but she went thence with changed skin, and cancelled spots. But how was this done ? She fell at the feet of Christ, and, with sighs from her heart, she vomited the sins from her soul." "Prosternere et tu, anima mea," as saith the same Bernard ; "and cast thou thyself down, O my soul, before the feet of Christ ; wipe them with thine hairs, wash them with thy tears ; which tears, washing his feet, may also purge thy soul. Wash his feet, and wash thyself with Mary Magdalen, till he say to thee, as he did to Mary Magdalen,—Thy sins are forgiven."

CH A P. XVI.

Of Sacrifice.

SACRIFICE is, within a little, as old as sin ; and sin is not much younger than the world. Adam, on the day of his creation (as is most probable), sinneth and sacrificeth : and, on the next day after, meditates on that ; whereunto his sacrifice aimeth, even Christ. Cain and Abel imitate the matter of their father's piety, sacrifice ; but Cain comes far short in the manner. Abel hath fire from heaven to answer him ; and Cain is as hot as fire, because he hath not. Noah takes an odd clean beast of every kind into his ark, for this purpose,—to sacrifice him, after his delivery. And so he does : but for the Chaldee paraphrast's fancy, that he "sacrificed on the very same altar, whereon Adam, and Cain, and Abel, had sacrificed so long before ;" I refer it to the belief of a Jew, who, by the poet, seems to be of a large faith ; "Credat Judæus Apella." Decency and order was observed of the fathers before the law, for this holy piece of worship. God makes Moses, in his Leviticus, to bring it into writing. While the Jews' temple stood, or while they might stand in the temple, they had their daily sacrifice ; till the great Sacrificer, offering himself, caused sacrifice and oblation to cease. Now are the Jews content,—and, as it appears in their Common Prayer Book, they beseech God to be so too,—with prayers without sacrifice, because they have not now access to their sacrificing place. Their distress (as they think it)

for this very thing, might teach them, that ‘Messias Nagidh’ or ‘Christ the Prince,’ hath done what Daniel to them, and an angel to Daniel, had prophesied of him.

Whether the heathens borrowed their custom of sacrificing from the Jews or from nature, it is not material. Sure I am, that the Jews borrowed some of their abominable sacrifices from the heathen: sacrificing of men is heathenism, in Moses’s language: yet was this too frequent among the Jews; used also in old time by the Athenians and Carthaginians,—as witness Plutarch, Lactantius, and others; and in these times by the Indians, as in Cortes, &c. Of this bad use (that the heathen had got), I cannot tell what should be the reason, unless they thought that cruelty was the best offering; or that their gods were more cruel than merciful. Or this reason may be given:—They had learned, either from the Jews, or from their oracles, or from the devil himself (who cares not to give men some light, thereby to lead them to the more darkness), that a man should once be offered, who should appease the wrath of God (as Christ was); and therefore they, in remembrance of this man, did sacrifice men, either to see whether they could light on this man,—or else in remembrance of him, till he should come.

Some condemn Jephthah of this cruelty, of sacrificing his own daughter; who yet, in Heb. xi, is commended for his faith. Austin doubts, whether it is to be counted God’s commandment, that he slew his own child. But I think no such doubt is necessary, since there is no such strictness of the words in the text. A heathen man in Plutarch, when he was told that he must either sacrifice his own child to such a goddess, or else his affairs and enterprises would not prosper, could answer, “that he would offer, with all his heart, such sacrifice, as the goddess would accept; but that she would desire, or would be pleased with, the blood and murder of his child, he could not be persuaded.”—I am sure, Jephthah had reason to be far better instructed, in such things as these, than any heathen in the world.

Varro holds, that it was not fit that any sacrifice at all should be offered. His reason, in Arnobius, is: “Quia Dii veri neque desiderant ea, neque deprecantur; ex ære autem facti, testa, gypso, vel marmore multo minus hæc curant:” “For (saith he) the true gods desire not, nor exact, any such matter; and those false gods, that are made of brass, mortar,

marble, &c. care less for them." The heathen man, in his own sense, saith only, for his meaning doubtless is,—that the gods, that are true gods, are not delighted with this cruelty, of slaying beasts; nor do they, for their own sustentation or provision, desire men to be at this charge. And so the true God, which is truth itself; though he commanded sacrifice, yet was it not merely in respect of himself, that he did it, any farther than this,—that men should, by this manner of worship, acknowledge their submission, and humility, and obedience, to him. For what cares he for beast or bullock, "since the world is his, and all that is in it^a?" And Lyranus does set down the special ends, wherefore God doth command Israel so many sacrifices:—

As, first, to wean them from idolatry: for their service of the true God required so much, that they could have hardly any time to think of idols. And the very beasts they sacrificed, might teach them the vanity of the idols of Egypt, which they once served: slaying of a bullock, a ram, a goat, might tell them, that the Egyptian Apis and Hammon, which they worshipped in these forms, were but vanity.

Secondly; By their sacrifices they acknowledged, that they had nothing but what they had received from God; and therefore, of their beasts, corn, wine, &c. they offered him, in thankfulness, some of his own.

Thirdly; These sacrifices were to bear Christ in their minds, till he should come and make a full atonement for them. And so says Lyra, "The very beasts, sacrificed, represent Christ,—an ox, for patience,—a sheep, for innocence,—and an ill-smelling goat, for his likeness to sinful flesh."

A fourth reason might be given; That the people, standing and seeing these beasts slain and fired, might remember their own deservings, and call to mind their sins, for which this beast was thus used. Their putting of their hands (the right hand, saith the Chaldee) upon the head of the beast, seems to import some such a matter as their acknowledgment of their deserving of that, which the beast was ready to suffer,—death and fire. Whosoever desires to be taken up with allegories about this piece of God's service, Flaviacensis will furnish him; and if he will not do, the fathers are copious enough, and, it may be, too much, this way.

^a Psal. l. 12.

The heathen mariners, in ship with Jonah, are said to sacrifice and vow vows; which the Chaldee helps out (as thinking the ship and a tempest unfit time and place for sacrifice) thus; "They promised they would sacrifice," viz. when they should come ashore; and vowed vows to become proselytes, saith Jarchi; or to give alms to the poor, saith Kimchi. Endless it were to trace the heathens, and to see how near, or how far, they be to, or from, the sacrifices of the Jews.

CHAP. XVII.

A just Judgment.

CRANTZIUS, the Denmark historian, as he hath many delightful passages of story,—so this especially, I could not but copy out, at my reading of it, wherein I see God just, and murder heavy. One was hired, for a sum of money, to murder an innocent Dane. He does the bloody fact; and presently receives, in a purse, his wages of iniquity. A heavy purse of gold, for a while, makes a light heart; but where the guiltiness groans heavy too, the gold is worth nothing. At last, the murderer's conscience accuseth and condemns him, like both witness and judge, for his bloody fact. His heart and eyes are both cast down; the one as far as hell, whither the fact had sunk,—and the other to the earth, whither the blood. He is now weary of his own life, as erewhile he was of another's. He ties his purse of gold (which had hired him to kill the other) about his neck, and offers it to every one he meets, as his reward if he would kill him. At last, he is paid in his own coin, and hires his own murderer with that price, wherewith he himself was hired. And so perish all such, whose feet are swift to shed blood; and he that strikes with an unlawful sword, be stricken with a lawful again. This man's case makes me to think of Cain, the old grandsire of all murderers;—of his heavy doom and misery, and burden and banishment. David once groaned under the burden of blood-guiltiness; but God, at his repenting, eased him^b: Judas takes a worse course than even Cain did, to be released of the sting of bloodshed^c. God grant I never know what it is to be guilty of shedding of blood, but only by reading.

^b Psal. li.

^c Matt. xxvii.

CHAP. XVIII.

Of the Name of the Red Sea.

IN Hebrew it is called 'Suph:' 'the sea of weeds:' "Because (saith Kimchi) there grew abundance of weeds upon the sides of it." In Greek, Latin, and English, and other western tongues, it is commonly called 'the Red Sea.' Divers reasons are given by divers persons, why it is so called: the best seems to me to be, from the redness of the ground about it. And so Herodotus speaks of a place thereabout, called 'Erythrobolus,' or 'the red soil.' It is thought, our country took the name of 'Albion,' from the like occasion, but not like colour,—as, from the white rocks or cliffs upon the sea-side. The Jews hold, that the whale, that swallowed Jonah, brought him into the Red Sea: and there showed him the way that Israel passed through it; for his eyes were as two windows to Jonah, that he looked out, and saw all the sea as he went. A whetstone^d; yet they will needs have some reason for this loud lie; and this is it, because Jonah, in chap. ii. 5, saith, "Suph hhabhush lero-shi," which is, "the weeds were wrapped about my head:" which they construe, "the Red Sea was wrapped about my head." And, to help the whale thither, Rabbi Japhet saith, that 'the Red Sea meets with the Sea of Japho, or the Mediterranean:' unless the Rabbin means, that they meet under ground, guess what a geographer he was: and if he find a way under ground, guess what a deep scholar. A long journey it was, for the whale to go up to Hercules' Pillars into the ocean, and from thence to the Red Sea, in three days and three nights: but the fabling Jews must find some sleight to maintain their own inventions.

CHAP. XIX.

Of the Word 'Raca.' Matt. v. 22.

"WHOSOEVER shall say unto his brother 'Raca,' shall be worthy to be punished by the council." The word is a Jewish nickname, and so used in the Talmud, for a despiteful title to a despised man; as, "Our Rabbins show a thing done with a religious man, that was praying in the highway: by comes a great man, and gives him the time of the day: but he saluted him not again: he stayed for him, till

^d "Et necessarium putant rationem aliquam inveniri fulciendo canoro huic figmento:" Leusden.

he had finished his prayer: after he had done his prayer, he said to him, 'Reka,' is it not written in your law, that you shall take heed to yourselves? Had I struck off thy head with my sword, who should have required thy blood," &c. And so goes the angry man on. Irenæus hath a phrase, nigh to the signification of this word; "Qui expuit cerebrum," "a man that hath no brains:" and so, 'Raka,' signifies a man empty, whether of understanding or goodness: so the Greek word κενός is frequently taken.

CHAP. XX.

Wit stolen by Jews out of the Gospel.

GOSPEL.

JEWS.

OUR Saviour saith to his disciples,—“The harvest truly is great, but the labourers are few^e.”

“Whosoever heareth these sayings, and doeth them, I will liken him to a man, that built his house upon a rock: and the rain descended, and floods came,” &c.

“And every one that heareth these sayings, and doeth them not, shall be likened to a foolish man, that built his house upon the sand^g.”

“Of every idle word that men speak, they shall give account thereof at the day of judgmentⁱ.”

“With what measure you mete, it shall be measured to you again^k.”

RABBI Simeon saith, “To-day is the harvest, and the work is much, and the labourers are idle, and the reward great, and the master of the house urgent^f.”

“He that learneth the law, and doth many good works, is like a man that built his house, the foundation of stone, and the rest of brick; and the waters beat, and the stone stood,” &c.

“But he that learneth the law, and doth not many good works, is like a man that built his house, the foundation of brick, and the rest of stone, &c; and the brick wasted^h,” &c.

The very same words almost in Orehhoth hhajim.

Rabbi Mair saith, “With the measure that a man measureth, they measure to him again^l.”

^e Matt. ix. 37.

Pirke Aboth, cap. 2.

^g Matt. vii. 24, 25, &c.

^h Aboth Rabbi Nathan.

ⁱ Matt. xii. 36.

^k Matt. vii. 2.

^l Sanhedrim.

The whole Lord's prayer might almost be picked out of their works; for they deny not the words, though they contradict the force, of it. The first words of it they use frequently,—as, “Our Father, which art in heaven,” in their Common Prayer Book, fol. 5: and, “Humble your hearts before your Father, which is in heaven,” in Rosh Hashana. But they have as much devotion towards the Father, while they deny the Son,—as the heathens had, which could say^m, “Our Father Jupiter,” and worshipped an unknown godⁿ. They pray almost in every other prayer, “Thy kingdom come,” and that ‘Bimherah bejamenu’ quickly, even in our days; but it is for an earthly kingdom, they thus look and pray. They pray, “Lead me not into temptation^o,” while they “tempt him, that led them in the wilderness, as did their fathers^p.” By this gospel, which they thus filch, they must be judged.

CHAP. XXI.

St. Cyprian's Nicety about the last Petition in the Lord's Prayer.

ST. CYPRIAN, it seemeth, is so fearful of making God the author of evil, that he will not think, that God leadeth any man into temptation. The petition he readeth thus: “Ne nos patiaris induci in tentationem;” “Suffer us not to be led into temptation, but deliver us from evil:” leaving the ordinary current and truth of the prayer, because he will not be accessory to imagine, that God should lead man into temptation: whereas all men, as well as he, do think, that God doth not lead man into evil temptations, as Satan doth, and yet that God doth tempt men. So he is said, in plain words, to have tempted Abraham. And Rabbi Tanchum wittily observes, that Abraham's two great temptations begin both with one strain, גֵּי גֵּי “Get thee gone.” The first, “Get thee gone out of thy country, from thy kindred and father's house^q,” the second, “Get thee gone to the land of Moriah, and offer thy son Isaac upon one of the mountains^r.”

May we not safely say here, that God led Abraham into temptation? But, as it follows, “liberavit a malo,” “God delivered him from the evil” of the temptation, which is being overcome. And St. James saith sweetly (though, at first,

^m Ζεῦ πάτερ ἡμέτερε Κρονίδη. frequent in Homer.

ⁿ Acts, xvii.

^o Fol. 4. Liturg.

^p Psal. xcv.

^q Gen. xii.

^r Gen. xxii.

he may seem to cross this petition), "Brethren, account it all joy, when ye fall into divers temptations^s:" to be in temptation is *joy*; "for God chastiseth every son, that he receiveth:" and yet pray, "lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil."—Let the latter comment upon the first; 'Lead us not into the evil of temptation;' which, in the apostle's phrase, is, "Suffer us not to be tempted above our strength."

CHAP. XXII.

Septuagint-Interpreters.

I WILL not, with Clemens, Josephus, Austin, Epiphanius, and others, spend time in locking them up severally in their closets, to make their translation the more admirable: I will only mind, that they did the work of this translation against their will, and, therefore, we must expect but slippery doing: and that appears by them. Their additions, variations, and (without doubt) oversights, may well argue, with what a will they went about this business. It were easy to instance, in thousands of places, how they add men and years^t: how they add matter of their own heads; as, how they help Job's wife to scold^u, adding there a whole verse of female passion. "I must now (saith she) go wander up and down, and have no place to rest in;" and so forth: and so Job i. 21, "Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return thither: the Lord hath given, and the Lord hath taken away; even as pleaseth the Lord, so come things to pass; blessed be the name of the Lord:" which clause,—'even as pleaseth the Lord, so come things to pass,'—is not in the Hebrew, but it is added by them; and so is it taken from them into our Common Prayer Book, in that part of the manner of burial. To trace them in their mistakes is pretty, to see how their unpricked Bible deceived them. As to instance in one or two, for a taste.

HEBREW.

Gen. xv. 11, it is said, that the birds light upon the carcasses, and Abraham drove them away: in Hebrew, וַיִּשַׁב, *vaijashhebh*.

SEPTUAGINT.

They read, instead of וַיִּשַׁב *vajashhebh*, 'he drove them away,'—וַיֵּשֶׁב *vajeshhebh*, 'he sat by them:' and of this St. Austin makes goodly allegories.

^s Πᾶσαν χάριν: Jac. i. 2.^t Gen. v. x, xi. and xlvi.^u Job, ii.

HEBREW.

Judges v. 8, the Hebrew saith, they chose new gods, "then **לַחֵם שְׁעָרִים** lahhem shegnarim, was war in the gates."

Judges vii. 11, the Hebrew saith, And he, and Phurah his servant, went down to the quarter (or side) of **חַמִּשִּׁים** Hhamushim, "the armed men."

SEPTUAGINT.

They say,—They chose new gods, "as **לַחֵם שְׁעָרִים** lehhem segnorim^v, barley bread."

They say,—He, and his servant Phurah, went down to the quarter of **חַמִּשִּׁים** Hhamishim, "fifty men."

Thus do they vary in a world of places, which the expert may easily see and smile at. I omit how they vary names of men and places. I will trouble you with no more but one, which they comment, as it were, to help a difficulty:—

1 Kings xii. 2, it is said of Jeroboam, that he dwelt in Egypt, **וַיֵּשֶׁב בְּמִצְרַיִם** vaijesh-hebh bemitzraijm.

2 Chron. x. 2, it is said, that he returned from Egypt, **וַיָּשָׁב מִמִּצְרַיִם** vaijashobh mimitzraijm.

The Septuagint heals this thus, translating 2 Chron. x. 2, *Καὶ κατώκησεν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, καὶ ἀπέστρεψεν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου*. "And he *had* dwelt in Egypt, and he returned out of Egypt."

Such is the manner of that work of the Greek. Now to examine the authority of this, we shall find it wonderful. That some of the Jewish synagogues read the Old Testament in Greek, and not in Hebrew, Tertullian seemeth to witness. But those were Jews out of Canaan: for they were not so skilful in the Greek tongue in Canaan, for aught I can find, as to understand it so familiarly: if they had been, I should have thought the Septuagint to be the book, that was given to Christ in the synagogue^w; because his text, that he reads, does nearer touch the Greek than the Hebrew: but I know their tongue was the Mesladoed^x-Chaldee.

The greatest authority of this translation appeareth in that the holy Greek of the New Testament doth so much follow it. For as God used this translation for a harbinger to the fetching in of the Gentiles,—so, when it was grown into authority, by the time of Christ's coming, it seemed good, to his infinite wisdom, to add to its authority himself, the better

^v ἄριστος κρείττωτος.

^w Luke, iv. 17.

^x "Syro-Chaldaicum:" Leusden.

to forward the building of the church. And admirable it is to see, with what sweetness and harmony the New Testament doth follow this translation, sometime even besides the letter of the Old,—to show that he, that gave the Old, may, and can, best expound it in the New.

CHAP. XXIII.

The Septuagint over authorized by some.

SOME there were in the primitive church, like the Romanists now, that preferred this translation of the Greek (as they do the Vulgar Latin), before the Hebrew fountain. Of these St. Austin speaks, and of their opinion herein, and withal gives his own, in his fifteenth book, ‘de Civitate Dei,’ cap. 11. 13, 14; where, treating of Methuselah’s living fourteen years after the flood, according to the Greek translation: “Hence came (saith he) that famous question, where to lodge Methuselah all the time of the flood. Some hold, that he was with his father (Enoch), who was translated, and that he lived with him there, till the flood was past. They hold thus, as being loath to derogate from the authority of those books, ‘quos in auctoritatem celebriorem suscepit ecclesia,’ ‘which the church hath entertained into more renowned authority:’ and thinking that the books of the Jews, rather than these, do mistake and err. For they say, that it is not credible, that the seventy interpreters, which translated at one time, and in one sense, could err, or would lie or err, where it concerned them not: but that the Jews, for envy they bear to us, seeing the law and prophets are come to us by their interpretation, have changed some things in their books, that the authority of ours might be lessened.” This is their opinion. Now his own he gives, chap. 13, in these words; “Let that tongue be rather believed, out of which a translation is made into another by interpreters.” And, in chap. 14; “The truth of things must be fetched out of that tongue, out of which that that we have, is interpreted.”

It is apparent, by most of the fathers, both Greek and Latin, how they followed the Greek, though, I think, not so much for affectation, as for mere necessity; few of them being able to read the Bible in Hebrew.

I will conclude with Clemens Alexandrinus’s reason, why God would have the Bible turned into Greek: *Διὰ τοῦτο Ἑλλήνων φωνῇ ἡρμηνεύθησαν αἱ γραφαί, ὥς μὴ πρόφασιν*

ἀγνοίας προβάλλεσθαι δυνήσῃναι [viz. "Ἑλλήνας ἢ τοὺς ἀπ' ἔθνῶν] οἷους τε ὄντας ἐπακοῦσαι τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν, ἣν μόνον ἐδέλυσαν". That is, "For this were the Scriptures interpreted in the Grecians' tongue,—that they might have no excuse for their ignorance, being able to understand our (Scriptures), if they would."

CHAP. XXIV.

Phrases taken from Jews in the New Testament.

THESE phrases are, by the great Broughton, called 'Talmudic-Greek,' when Jewish and Talmudical phrases are used in Holy Writ: such is "Gehenna," frequent in all Rabbins. "Maran-atha^x," the bitter excommunication. "The world to come," so often used in the gospel, and nothing more often among the Jews and Chaldees. 'Raca^y,'—of which, see chap. xix. "Jannes and Jambres^z," whose names I find in the Chaldee paraphrast, with very little difference, and a goodly legend of them. As^a,—"Pharaoh slept, and saw in his dream; and, behold, all the land of Egypt was put in one scale, and a^b young lamb in the other scale; and the lamb weighed down the scales of himself. Out of hand^c, he sends and calls all the sorcerers of Egypt, and tells them his dream: out of hand, Janis and Jimbres, chief of the sorcerers, opened their mouths, and said unto Pharaoh; There is a child to be born, of some of the congregation of Israel, by whose hands all the land of Egypt shall be wasted: therefore, the king consulted with the Jewish midwives," &c. And, in Exod. vii. 11, he calls them, Janis and Jambres. And, that you might the better understand who these two were, the Hebrew comment upon the Chaldee text saith, "They were scholars, for their art of enchanting, to the noble wizard Balaam:" and so he fetches Zophar for authority to maintain them. And to prove Janis and Jambres either very constant enemies and opposers to Moses, or else very good dutiful scholars to Balaam; the Chaldee saith, that "these two were the two servants, that went with Balaam^d," when he went to curse Israel.

Beelzebub, or, as the New Testament Greek calls it, 'Beelzebubul,' is a wicked phrase, used by the Jews of Christ,

^u Strom. 1. pag. 124.^x 1 Cor. xvi. 22.^y Matt. v. 22.^z 2 Tim. iii. 8.^a In Exod. i. 15.^b Chal. Talia bar imera.^c Chal. Miiadh. 'out of hand,' a phrase most usual in Jews' authors, and the very same in English, 'out of hand.'^d Num. xxii. 22.

Mark iii. 22, and elsewhere. Now, whether this change of the last letter were, among the Jews, accidental, or of set purpose, I cannot determine. Such ordinary variation of letters, without any other reason, even use of every country affords. So 'Reuben' is, in the Syrian, called 'Rubil^e.' So the Greek and Latin 'Paulus,' is, in the Syrian, 'Phaulus;' in Arabian, 'Baulus.' But some give a witty reason of *l* in 'Beelzebub;' that the Jews, in derision of the Ekronites' god, Baalzebub (which was a name bad enough, 'the god of a fly'), gave him a worse, 'Baalzebub,' 'the god of a sir-reverence;' for so *בז* signifies in Chaldean.

To omit any more Jewish phrases, honoured by the New Testament using them,—this very thing does show, the care is to be had for the right reading of the Greek; since so many idioms, and so many kinds of style, are used by it.

CHAP. XXV.

Nineveh's Conversion. Jonah iii.

THE Book of Jonah is wholly composed of wonders. Some hold Jonah to be wonderful in his birth: as that he should be the son of the Sarepta-widow, whom Elijah raised to life: and because the mother of the child said, "Now I know that the word of God in thy mouth is true;" therefore, he is called, 'Ben Amittai,' 'the son of my truth:' whether the story may be called, 'Ben Amittai,' or 'a true story,'—let the reader censure, by the two towns of Sarepta and Gath-hepher. Howsoever Jonah was wondrous in his birth, I am sure he was wondrous in his life. A prophet, and a runagate, before his shipwreck,—a man drowned, and yet alive, in his shipwreck,—and a preacher of repentance, and yet a repiner at repentance, after. The least wonder in the Book, is not the conversion of Nineveh. "It was a great wonder (as D. Kimchi says), that Jonah was in the belly of the fish three days and three nights, and yet lived. And it was another wonder, that he was not stupid, but continued in his senses and intellectuals, and prayed." And do but well consider it, and it will appear almost as great a wonder, that Nineveh, so great a town, so long wicked, in so short time should be converted. To say as Rabbi Joshua doth, "That the men of the ship were got to Nineveh, and had told all the

occurrence about Jonah,—how they had thrown him over hatches, and yet he it was that was among them, and therefore they believed the sooner;” as it is without authority,—so doth it lessen the wonder of the town’s conversion.

Jonah, an unknown man, of a foreign people, to come into so great a city, with ‘a forty days, and Nineveh shall be destroyed,’ was strange: but for the king, upon so short a time, to send a crier to proclaim repentance, is as strange, if not stranger. Jonah proclaims the town shall be destroyed; the king (in a manner) proclaims, the town shall not be destroyed, by proclaiming the means how to save it,—repentance. To say, as Aben Ezra^f does, “That because the city is called ‘Gnir gedholah leelohim,’ ‘a great city of God,’ that therefore they feared God in old time; but now, in Jonah’s time, began to do evil,”—is still to lessen the wonder about their conversion: a stranger repentance than which the world never saw. The old world had a time of warning, of years, for Nineveh’s hours, and yet “eat and drank, till the flood came;” and then, “in the floods of many waters^g,” repentance and prayers would not come near God. Fair warning had Sodom by the preaching of Lot, whose righteous soul they vexed,—and would not repent, till their hell, as it were, began from heaven, and fire and brimstone brought them to the lake of fire and brimstone; and when the wicked seed of him, that derided his father’s nakedness, perished for their naked beastliness,—and their flames of lust brought them to flames on earth and in hell. The men of Nineveh shall rise up in judgment against the generation of the Jews, and condemn them; because these, at the preaching of Jonah, repented,—and they not, for the preaching of a greater than Jonah, that was among them. When the master of the vineyard sent his servants, nay, his own son, they put him to death. In the conversion and delivery of Nineveh, I cannot but admire a double mercy of God, who (to use a father’s words) “*Sic dedit pœnitentibus veniam, qui sic dedit peccantibus pœnitentiam:*” who was so ready, upon their repentance, to grant them pardon, who was so ready, upon his threatening, to give them repentance.

^f Aben Ezra gives two reasons, of poor force, to prove that Nineveh feared God in old time. 1. Because otherwise he would not have sent his prophet to them; and so he lessens the wonder of God’s mercy. 2. Because we read not that they brake their images; therefore, they had not any. How far the Rab. is besides the cushion, both for construction and reason, one of small skill may judge. ^g Psal. xxxii.

Other kind of entertainment than Jonah had, had he, that came from Gregory, bishop of Rome, to preach to our realm of England. The passage of which story our countryman Bede hath fully related:—That when Austin had preached the gospel to the king, and dehorted him from his irreligious religion; Your words (saith the king) are good; but I have been trained up so in the religion I now follow, that I cannot forsake it to change for a new. This argument too many superstitious souls ground upon in these days, choosing rather to err with Plato, than to follow the truth with another; desiring rather to be, and being as they desire, of a false religion, than to forsake the profession of their parents and predecessors; not refusing (like good fellows) to go to hell for company, rather than to heaven alone. Such a boon-companion was Rocharus, king of the Phrisons: of whom it is recorded, that whereas a bishop had persuaded him so far towards Christianity, as that he had got him into the water to baptize him,—the king there questions, which way his forefathers went, which died unbaptized, whether to heaven or hell? The bishop answers, That most certainly they were gone to hell. Then will I go the same way with them (saith the wicked king); and pulls back his foot out of the water, and would not be baptized at all. “Hoc animus meminisse horret luctuque refugit.”

CHAP. XXVI.

Of the Jews' Sacraments, Circumcision and Passover.

BOTH these sacraments of the Jews, were with blood: both in figure: the one, to carry the memory of Christ till he came,—and the other, the passion of him, being come. “Abraham received the sign of circumcision, the seal of the righteousness of faith, which he had when he was uncircumcised^h:” the Israelites received the institution of the Passover in Egyptⁱ. I will not stand to allegorize these matters, of the time and manner of receiving these two, but only of the things themselves.

Circumcision, given in such a place, is not for nothing: but, in the place of generation, it is given Abraham, as a seal of his faith, that “he should be the Father of all those that believe^j:” and, especially, a seal to him of Christ’s

^h Rom. iv.

ⁱ Exod. xii.

^j Rom. iv.

coming from those loins, near to which his circumcision was. And appertaining to this I take to be the oath that Abraham gives his servant, and that Jacob gives Joseph, with their hands put under their thighs^k; not to swear by their circumcision,—but by Christ, that should come from those thighs. Circumcision was also used for distinction of an Israelite, at the first; and hence were they distinguished: but in time, Ishmael had taught his race so much; and Egyptians, Phœnicians, Arabians, and the countries about them, grew circumcised. So was Pythagoras circumcised, that he might have access to the recluse mysteries of the Egyptians' religion.

Circumcision was also used, with the Jews, as baptism with us, for admission into the church of Israel. And it was God's express command, that the child, on the eighth day, should be circumcised. "And on that day, more than any other (saith St. Austin), to signify Christ's resurrection, who rested the week's end in the grave, and rose on the eighth day." And if Aristotle say true, one may give a reason, why not before the eighth day: "because a child, for the seven days, is most dangerous for weakness." A stranger was so admitted to their congregation^l. And of this does Rabbi Eliezer fantastically expound that verse in Jonah i. 16; "Then the men feared the Lord exceedingly, and offered sacrifice:" whereupon the wandering Jew saith thus; "As soon as the mariners saw (when they drew near to Nineveh) all the wonders that the blessed God did to Jonah, they stood and cast every one his gods into the sea. They returned to Joppa, and went up to Jerusalem, and circumcised the flesh of their foreskin; as it is said, 'And the men feared the Lord exceedingly, and sacrificed sacrifices;' what sacrifice? but this blood of the circumcision, which is as the blood of a sacrifice: and they vowed to bring every one his wife and children, and all that he had, to fear the Lord God of Jonah; and they vowed and performed."

This was, indeed, the way to admit proselytes, by circumcision; but in Solomon's time, when they became proselytes by thousands, they admitted them by baptism, or washing, as some Jews do witness.

Whether the neglect of circumcision (as I may so term it) in the wilderness, were merely politic, because of their

^k As the Jews think.

^l Exod. xii. 48.

more fitness, for any moment's removal, and march; or whether some mystery were in it, I will not decide. Nor need I relate how the Jews used to circumcise their children; for the great Buxtorfius hath punctually done it: nor can I relate how highly the Jews prize their circumcision; for one might gather volumes out of them upon this subject. For they consider not, that 'he is not a Jew, which is one outward: neither is that circumcision, which is outward, in the flesh. But he is a Jew, which is one within; and the circumcision is of the heart, in the spirit, not in the letter, whose praise is not of men, but of God.'

CHAP. XXVII.

Of the Passover.

THE Passover was a full representation of Christ's passion: though to the Jews, the Passover was more than a mere shadow. To run through the parts of it might be more than copious: a word and away.

At the Passover, the beginning of the year is changed;—so, at Christ's Passover, the beginning of the week is changed.

The Passover was either of a lamb, to signify Christ's innocency; or of a kid, to signify his likeness to sinful flesh: as Lyranus.

The lamb, or kid, was taken up and kept four days, to see whether it were spotless: and (it may be) to scour and cleanse himself from his grass.

The Passover slain at even; his blood to be sprinkled with a bunch of hyssop; he was to be roasted with fire;—so, Christ slain at even; Christ's blood sprinkled; [and of this, I think, David may be understood, Psal. li, "Cleanse me with hyssop;" that is, Besprinkle me with the blood of the true paschal Lamb, Jesus Christ:] so, Christ tried with fire of affliction.

These parts were to be roasted,—his head; his legs; his inward parts;—so, was Christ tortured: his head with thorns; his hands and feet with nails; his inwards, with a spear.

Their eating of him, as it concerned the Israelites in their estate, so may it instruct Christians for the eating of the true Passover, the Lord's supper.

The Passover eaten, without leaven; with bitter herbs;

with loins girt; with feet shod; with staff in hand; in haste;—so, the sacrament of the supper to be eaten, without leaven of malice; with bitter repentance; with resolution of amendment; with preparation to walk better; leaning on the staff of true faith; hasting to leave this worldly Egypt.

Thus was the Passover first eaten in Egypt: after which all Egypt is struck with death of the first-born; and the Egyptians are now punished with death of their children, for murdering Israel's children. This night was ill to them; but the night in the Red Sea was worse.

At the death of a lamb,—Egypt is destroyed; Israel delivered;—so, by the death of a Lamb, hell is destroyed; mankind delivered.

When Israel comes out of Egypt, they bring up with them Joseph's bones; and so, as he brought them down thither, so they bring him up thence.

So, when Christ comes up out of his grave, he brings dead bones with him, by raising some out of their graves. I cannot think it idle, that the Passover was at night, and that St. Paul saith, "the Israelites were baptized in the sea," which was also by night, and "in the cloud;" but to show, that these sacraments of Israel looked for a dawning, when the true Light, which they foresignified, should appear.

The Jews do find thirteen precepts, negative and affirmative, about the keeping of the Passover:—

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| 1. The slaying of it, | Exod. xii. 6. |
| 2. The eating of it, | 8. |
| 3. Not to eat it raw or boiled, | 9. |
| 4. Not to leave aught of it, | 10. |
| 5. The putting away of leaven, | 15. |
| 6. The eating of unleavened bread, | 18. |
| 7. That leaven be not found with them, | 19. |
| 8. Not to eat aught mixed with leaven, | 20. |
| 9. An apostate Jew not to eat it, | 43. |
| 10. A stranger not to eat it, | 45. |
| 11. Not to bring forth the flesh of it, | 46. |
| 12. Not to break a bone of it, | 46. |
| 13. No uncircumcised to eat of it, | 48. |

How variously they comment upon these, as they do upon all things,—and how over-curious they be in observing these, as they do all things,—their writings do witness. Their folding of their bitter herbs,—their three unleavened cakes,

—their water and salt,—their searching for leaven,—their casting forth of leaven,—and their cursing of leaven,—their graces over their tables,—their prayers over their hands, as they wash them,—their words over their unleavened bread,—their remembering how they lived in Egypt, and came out,—their words over their bitter herbs,—their Passover-psalms, the hundred and thirteenth and hundred and fourteenth; all these, and their other ceremonies, are set down accurately in their Common Prayer Book, which I would not have denied to the reader in English, both for his recreation, satisfaction, and some instruction, but that I know not whether I should ‘actum agere;’ ‘do that which some one hath done before.’ And besides, I write these things, not as ἔργα, but πάρεργα,—not set studies, but stolen hours; employing my idle hours to the writing of these studies, that I may witness to some, that my whole time is not idle. But, it may be, I may seem more idle in thus writing, than if I had been idle indeed: to them that think thus, I can only answer,—‘It is youth: age may do better.’

CHAP. XXVIII.

Of the Confusion of Tongues.

THAT the world, from Babel, was scattered into divers tongues, we need not other proof, than as Diogenes proved, that there is motion, by walking,—so we may see the confusion of languages, by our confused speaking. “Once all the earth was of one tongue, one speech, and one consent; for they all spake in the holy tongue, wherein the world was created in the beginning” (to use the very words of the Chaldee paraphrast and Targum Jerusalem, upon Gen. xi. 1). But “pro peccato dissentionis humanæ” (as saith St. Austin), “for the sin of men disagreeing, not only different dispositions, but also different languages, came into the world.” They came to Babel with a disagreeing agreement; and they come away, punished with a speechless speech. They disagree among themselves, “cum quisque principatum ad se rapit,” “while every one strives for dominion;” as the same Austin. They agree against God in their “Nagnavad lan Siguda,” &c. “We will make ourselves a rendezvous for idolatry;” as the same Jerusalamy. But they come away speaking each to other, but not understood of each other;

and so speak to no more purpose, than if they spake not at all. This punishment of theirs at Babel, is like Adam's corruption, hereditary to us ; for we never come under the rod at grammar-school, but we smart for our ancestors' rebellion at Babel.

Into how many countries and tongues^a those Shinar rebels were scattered, is no less confused work to find out, than was theirs at the tower. So divers is the speech of men, about the diversity of speech, that it makes the confusion more confused. "Euphorus, and many other historians say, that the nations and tongues are seventy-five; listening to the voice of Moses, which saith, All the souls that came into Egypt, out of Jacob, were seventy-five. But in truth, the natural dialects (of speech) appear to be seventy-two, as our Scriptures have delivered." Thus saith Clemens Alexandrinus^b: of whose conceit herein I must, for my part, say, as St. Ambrose saith of Aaron, about the golden calf,—*"Tantum Sacerdotem,"* &c. "So great a scholar as Clemens, I dare not censure, though I dare not believe him." The Jews, with one consent, maintain, that there are just seventy nations, and so many tongues. So confident they are of this, that they dare say, that the seventy souls, that went with Jacob into Egypt, were as much as all the seventy nations of the world. Jerusalem's schools rang with this doctrine, and the children learned to high-prize themselves from their fathers. A stately claim was this to Israel, but the keeping of it dangerous. Men of the seventy nations would not be so undervalued by one people. Therefore, when Israel wanted strength to keep this challenge, they do it by sleight. And so it is the thrice-learned Master Broughton's opinion, that the Septuagint, when they were to translate the Bible, and were to speak of the seventy souls of Jacob's house,—they durst not put down the just number of seventy, lest tales should have been told out of their schools concerning their scornful doctrine; and when the rumour and the number should both come to the king of Egypt, the meet number might maintain the truth of the rumour, and by both they might incur danger; therefore, they added five^c more, to spoil the roundness of the sum; and St. Stephen follows

^a One, in Epiphanius, saith, this is easy to find, but he doth little towards it. Epiph. cont. Hæret. tom. 2. lib. 6.

^b Εὐφορος δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι τῶν ἱστορικῶν, &c. Clem. Alex. Strom. 1.

^c So, in Gen. x, the Septuagint put in two Canaans: and so spoil the roundness of that seventy.

their translation: "Then Joseph sent and called his father Jacob to him, and all his kindred, even seventy-five souls^d."

As the Jews seek to retain this their assumed dignity over the seventy nations by this sleight, so do they maintain their tenet of just seventy nations, by a double reason:—First, They count polls in the plain of Shinar, as Moses did in the wilderness; and they find, in the tenth of Genesis, just seventy men; and therefore, by necessary consequence, just seventy nations. The Chaldee, upon these words of God, "Come, let us go down^e," loses the sweet mystery of the Trinity^f, but finds, I know not how many strange fancies; for thus he descants: "The Lord said unto the seventy angels that are before him, Come, now let us go down, and confound there their tongue, that a man shall not understand his fellow." And a little after he saith, "And with him (that is, with God) were seventy angels; according to the seventy nations." I doubt not, but the tenth chapter was his ground for so many men; but I know not where he should find so many angels. Seventy men are, indeed, named in the tenth chapter; but were all those at Babel? and, if they were, must those seventy needs speak seventy tongues? A whole dozen of them, Canaan and his eleven sons, sit down close together, in, or (at least) not far out of, the small compass of Canaan: where they all differed not (if any at all did) in language, being seated so nigh together. That Edomites, Moabites, Amalekites, and Ammonites, spake not Hebrew, is Theodoret's^g opinion; but that all these, and Canaan, differed in maternal tongues, before Israel planted it,—I cannot conceive. Nay, that Canaan spake Hebrew before Joshua came there, I could be persuaded to believe, for three reasons:—

First; The old names of Canaan-towns are significant in Hebrew: 'Jebus,' 'trodden down,' by heathens then, as it is now by the Turks; "Kirjath-arbang," "the city of Arba^h;" Jericho, 'he shall smell it,' the city of palm-trees. The sinful city, Zeboim, hath in the text a fair Hebrew name, 'Zebhiim,' that is, 'the Roes,'—a name, too good for so bad a town; therefore, the margin gives it another name, 'Zebho-

^d Acts, vii. 14.

^e Gen. xi. 5.

^f Julian, the heretic, both denies the Trinity to be meant in this place, and saith, 'God alone was unable for this work.' Cyrill. tom. 3. lib. 4.

^g Quæst. 60. on Gen.

^h Josh. xiv. 15.

jim.' Infinite it is to trace all Hebrew Canaanitish names ; who will, may try at pleasure and leisure.

Secondly ; Sure I am, that one chief town in Canaan (if not then also, as afterward, the chiefest), that is, Jerusalem, was Hebrew, when it was governed by Melchisedek, or Shem : who were all one, as the Chaldeesⁱ, Jews^j, and most Christians, do hold. Then did Shem make Canaan a servant^k, under his rule ; and, I doubt not, but under his tongue also.

Thirdly ; I see that a woman, Rahab, understands the Hebrews at the first sight, and speaks to them (for aught we find) without interpreter.

I find the Amorites and Sidonians differing in the name of Hermon,—one calling it Sirion, and the other Shenir^l. But I see not, but both the Hebrews, and some Canaanites, agree in the name Hermon. This ground-work, then, of seventy men's being named in the tenth of Genesis, to import necessarily seventy tongues in the eleventh chapter, I cannot entertain : yet refer myself to better judgment.

The second reason for seventy tongues, they fetch out of Moses^m, from these words, “ When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance ; when he separated the sons of Adam ; he set the bounds of the people, according to the number of the children of Israel.” What all Jews thought and gathered from that place, let two speak for the rest : those be Jonathan Ben Uzziel, and Rasi. Jonathan reads the verse in Chaldee, thus ; “ When the Highest gave possession of the world to the people, that descended of the sons of Noah ; when he divided letters and tongues to the sons of men, in the age of the division, &c ; at that time, he sets the bounds of the nations, according to the number of the souls of Israel, that went down into Egypt :” thus the Chaldee.—Rasi comments to the same purpose, in these words ; “ When the holy blessed He gave to those that provoked him, the portion of their inheritance, he overwhelmed and drowned them. When he scattered the generation of the division, it was in his power to have passed them out of the world ; yet did he not so, but sets borders of the people. He reserves them, and does not destroy them. (According to the number) For the number of the children of Israel, which were to come of the sons of Shem, and according to the

ⁱ See the Targums on Gen. x.

^j Vid. Mr. Broughton's Melchis.

^k Gen. ix. 26.

^l Deut. iii. 9.

^m Deut. xxxii. 8.

number of the seventy souls of the sons of Israel, that went down into Egypt: (he set bounds of the people) seventy tongues:" thus far the Rabbin: who is so confident of this number of seventy languages, that he saith, there were men of the seventy nations in the ship with Jonahⁿ. Thus are the Jews current for seventy,—the Greeks^o for seventy-two; upon what ground, I know not; unless the two Canaans, in Gen. x, in the Greek Bible, make up this number to them. Some linguists have summed up the usual tongues and dialects, but seventy or seventy-two maternals I never saw. Modern tongues are like the old ship Argo; patched up with so many pieces, that it is hard to tell which is a piece of old Argo.

CHAP. XXIX.

Of Letters.

THAT the Hebrew tongue was from the foundation of the world, none deny; but, whether the letters be so ancient, some question. Some hold, that those letters, that God wrote with his own hand in the two tables, were the first letters, that ever were written. The studious Pliny thinks, that "among the Assyrians, letters have been always;" but Gellius thinks, they were invented in Egypt by Mercury; and others think, among the Syrians. If we examine Pliny well, we shall find him true in the first and last,—however in the middle. If the Assyrian tongue were the Chaldee tongue (as most like it was), then were those letters from the beginning of the world; the Hebrew and Chaldee letter being all one, unless the Assyrian differed from both. If you take Syrian in the sense that Theodoret does, for Hebrew,—then Pliny speaks true, that letters were first among the Syrians. For Theodoret calls the Hebrew tongue 'Syrian,' as the gospel^p calls the Syrian tongue 'Hebrew.' But Pliny concludes, that Cadmus first brought letters into Greece out of Phœnicia. Justin Martyr saith, that Greece thinks so herself. Athanasius holdeth the Phœnicians for the first inventors of letters. That the Phœnicians and Syrians first found out letters, is a received opinion in Clemens Alexandrinus. Eupolemus thinks, that the Phœnicians received grammar from the Jews, and the Greeks from the Phœnicians. And Euphorus thinks, that Cadmus

ⁿ Jonah i.

^o Clem. Alex. Epiphanius, Comestor, &c.

^p John, xix. 20.

was he, that conveyed them. Chærilus, in Eusebius, makes Phœnicians and Jews all one: for he nameth Jews in Xerxes' army, and names their tongue the Phœnician: his words be these:—

Τῶν δ' ὅπιδεν διέβαινε γένος θαυμαστὸν ἰδέσθαι·
Γλῶσσαν μὲν Φοίνισσαν ἀπὸ στόματος ἀφιέντες·
Ὡκουν δ' ἐν Σολύμοις ὄρεσι πλατέη παρὰ λίμνη.

In English thus:

A wondrous people march'd behind along :
Their dialect was the Phœnician tongue.
On the hills of Solymæ they dwelt : thereby
A spacious lake, not far remote, doth lie.

These Phœnicians (if you will call them so), or Jews, were the first, that had letters. But the Jews were not Phœnicians indeed, nor their tongue the same; yet, for bordering of their countries, the poet makes them all one. The Phœnician is not now to be had, unless the Punic^a or Carthaginian, and Phœnic or Phœnician, were all one; which most like they were. And then, some few lines of the tongue are to be found in Plautus's Pænulus; which, as Paræus saith, can little or nothing be made of. Eusebius speaks of Sanconiathon, that wrote the Phœnician history in the same tongue, but more of the language he saith not: but to the matter. That letters were so long in use before the giving of the law, I am induced to believe, upon these reasons:—

First; Josephus is of this mind, that letters were before the flood. And the Scripture cites Enoch's prophecy,—which whether it were written by him or not, is uncertain: yet, if there were any such thing, those many places, which we find of it in Tertullian, Clemens, and others,—do argue, that so much could not punctually be kept by word of mouth.

A second reason to move me to think of letters before the giving of the law, is, to think of Joseph's accounts in Egypt, which seem almost impossible without writing.

Thirdly; But, omitting that, I cannot see how all arts and sciences in the world should then flourish, as (considering their infancy) they did, without the ground-work of all learning,—letters.

Fourthly; Again, for the Jews, upon the writing of the law, to be put to spelling (as they that had never seen letters

^a The Syrian translating of the word 'Phœnicia,' in the New Testament, seems to confirm this.

before), and not to be able to read it, had been a law upon the law, adding to the hardness of it.

Fifthly; Nor can I think, that, when Moses saith, “Blot me out of thy book,” that he taketh the metaphor from his own books (which, it is probable, he had not yet written); but from other books, which were then abounding in the world.

Sixthly; The Egyptian chronicles, of so many thousand years, in Diodorus and Laertius, I know, are ridiculous; yet their carefulness of keeping records, I have ever believed. “The Greeks were boys to them,” as it is in Plato: and Moses was ‘scholar’ to them, or their learning^r.

Now, I cannot think, that this their exceeding human learning, was kept only in their brains, and none in writing: nor do I think, that, if it were written, it was deciphered only in their obscure hieroglyphics; but that some of it came to ordinary writing of familiar letters.

CHAP. XXX.

Of the Hebrew Tongue.

WHOSO will go about to commend the Hebrew tongue, may justly receive the censure, that he of Rome did, who had made a long book in the praise of Hercules: “This labour is in vain; for never any one dispraised Hercules.”—Other commendations this tongue needeth none, than what it hath of itself; namely, for sanctity, it was the tongue of God,—and for antiquity, it was the tongue of Adam; God the first founder, and Adam the first speaker, of it. In this tongue were laid up the mysteries of the Old Testament. It began with the world and the church, and continued and increased in glory, till the captivity in Babel,—which was a Babel to this tongue, and brought to confusion this language, which, at the first confusion, had escaped without ruin. At their return, it was in some kind repaired, but far from former perfection. The Holy Scriptures were reviewed by Ezra, a scribe fit for the kingdom of heaven, in whose treasure were things new and old. In the Maccabean times, all went to ruin,—language, and laws, and all, lost: and since that time to this day, the pure Hebrew hath lost her familiarity, being only known by scholars, or, at least, not without

^r Acts, vii.

teaching. Our Saviour's times spake the Syrian,—as Kephah, Golgotha, Talitha, and other words do witness: in after-times, the unwearied Masorites arose, helpers to preserve the Bible Hebrew entire,—and grammarians, helpers to preserve the idiom alive; but for restoring it to the old familiarity, neither of them could prevail. For the Jews have, at this day, no abiding city, no commonwealth, no proper tongue; but speak as the countries, wherein they live. This, whereof they were once most nice, is gone, and this groat^r they have lost. As the man in Seneca, that, through sickness, lost his memory, and forgot his own name; so they, for their sins, have lost their language, and forgot their own tongue. Their Cain-like wandering,—after the murder of their brother, according to the flesh, Christ Jesus,—hath lost them this precious mark of God's favour, and branded them with a worse mark, "*Cauterio conspirationis antiquæ*," as saith St. Bernard, in another case. Before the confusion of tongues, all the world spake their tongue and no other; but since the confusion of the Jews, they speak the language of all the world, and not their own. And that it is not with them so, only of late, but hath been long, Theodoret^s beareth witness in these words; "Other nations have their children speaking quickly in their own mother-tongue. Howbeit, there are no children of the Hebrews, who naturally speak the Hebrew tongue, but the language of the country where they are born. Afterward, when they grow up, they are taught the letters, and learn to read the Holy Scripture in the Hebrew tongue."

About this their training up of their children, and growth of men, in their own tongue and learning: a Rabbin hath this saying in Pirke Aboth^t: "Ben H. H. says, At five years old, for the Scripture: at ten, for Misna; at thirteen, for the commandment^u; at fifteen, for the Talmud; at eighteen, for marriage; at twenty, for service; at thirty, for strength; at forty, for understanding; at fifty, for counsel; at sixty, for old age; at seventy, for gray hairs; at eighty, for profoundness^v; at ninety, for meditation; at one hundred, he is as dead, and past, and gone out of the world." The Jews look for a pompous kingdom, when Messias, the son of David, shall come, whom they watch for every moment, till he come; as

^r "*Thesaurum*:" Leusden.

^u Or, phylacteries, &c.

^s In Quæst. on Gen. lix. lx.

^t Cap. 1.

^v Or fortitude (of mind), or God.

it is in the twelfth article of their creed, in their Common Prayer Book. He shall restore them (as they hope) a temporal kingdom (and of that mind, till they were better taught, were the apostles^x); and then their tongue shall revive again, as they surmise. But the divine Apocalyptic writing, after Jerusalem was ruined, might teach them, what the second Jerusalem must be,—not on earth, but from heaven^y. But to return to their tongue.

The characters, we now have the Hebrew tongue in, Scaliger thinks are but of a latter hatch, and not the same that the Jews used from Moses, till the destruction of the temple: for they used the Phœnician or Canaanian character, which is now called the Samaritan:—how truly, I refer to the reader's judgment.

The character we now have, is either a set or a running letter: the first, the Bible is ordinarily printed in; in the latter, the most of the Rabbins.

The whole tongue is contained in the Bible; and no one book else, in the world, contains in it a whole language. And this shows, that the Scripture speaks to all sorts of people, since it speaks of all sorts of things. This language is (as God said the Jews should be, if they would keep his law) 'a lender to all, and a borrower of none.' All tongues are in debt to this, and this to none. The eastern, most especially, must acknowledge this. "Some men in the east (saith Origen) reserve their old speech (meaning, by likelihood, the Hebrew), and have not altered it, but have continued in the eastern tongue, because they have continued in the eastern countries." No eastern tongue, that I have heard of, is Hebrew now; so that, what to say to Origen, I cannot tell:—unless he mean, that those, that have continued in the east, have kept nearest this holy tongue, because nearest the holy land: this, to be true, is known to the meanest learned; in their speech it is apparent, and, by their writing, confirmed. All of them have learned, from the Hebrew, to write from the right hand to the left (or, as we usually call it, in England, to write and read backward),—the China and Japan writing excepted: which is, indeed, from the right hand to the left, but not with the lines crossing the leaf, as other tongues do, but the lines down the leaf. A strange way, by itself.

^x Acts, i. 6.

^y Apoc. xxi. 2.

Again; Most of the eastern tongues do use the Hebrew character for quick writing, or some other end. The Chaldee letter is the very same. The Syrian, though it have two or three kinds of its own, yet is content sometime to take upon it the Hebrew character. The Arabian doth the like; especially the Jews, in Turkey, use, in hatred of Mahometans, to write down their matters of religion, in the Hebrew character, though in the Arabian tongue. So do the Christian Arabians, for the same cause, in their holy things, use the Arabian tongue, but Syrian letter. And I take a place in Epiphanius to be meant to this purpose, also, about the Persian tongue. His words, out of another, are these; "The Persians, besides their own letters, do also use the letters of the Syrians: as, in our times, many nations use the Greek, though almost every nation hath a proper character." I refer to the reader to judge, whether he mean not that the Persians (as other countries about them did) did use the Hebrew character for their quick writing; which is called Syrian, by Theodoret.

To speak of the grace, and sweetness, and fulness, of the Hebrew tongue, is to no purpose to relate; for even those, that cannot read this tongue, have read thus much of it.

CHAP. XXXI.

Of Vowels.

EASTERN tongues, especially the Hebrew, and her three dialects, Chaldee, Syrian, and Arabian, are written, sometimes with vowels, sometimes without: with, for certainty; without, for the speedier writing: we have Hebrew Bibles of both kinds. The Septuagint, it seems, translated by the unpricked Bible; as St. Jerome, in his Commentary upon the prophets, seemeth to import, and as, to any one that examineth, it is easy to find. Instead of all other places, in Gen. iv. 7, it is apparent: where the seventy translators, reserving the letters, have strangely altered the vowels.

The Hebrew hath it thus, הָלוֹא אִם תִּשְׁבֵּחַ שְׂאֵת וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁבֵּחַ לִפְתָּח הַשַּׁעַת רַבָּץ "Halo im tetibh seeth, veim lo tetibh, lappethahh hhatath robhets;" which is, in English, thus: "If thou do well, shalt thou not be accepted? And if thou do not well, sin lieth at the door:" they translate it as pointed thus, הָלוֹא אִם תִּשְׁבֵּחַ שְׂאֵת וְאִם לֹא תִשְׁבֵּחַ לִפְתָּח הַשַּׁעַת רַבָּץ "Halo im tetibh seeth, veim lo tetibh lephatteahh hhatatha

rebhats :” which is, “ If thou do well in offering, and do not well in dividing, thou hast sinned ; be quiet.” This, follow with one consent, the Greek and many of the Latin fathers. They could not thus translate, because they knew not the text, or because they wanted pointed Bibles,—but on set purpose to hide pearls from swine (as the best learned think). But that they did always miss on set purpose (where they missed), their many lapses seem to deny : but sometime they mistook the unpricked text, and so misconstrued. A vowelled Bible they might have had, but would not.

Some there be, that think the vowels of the Hebrew were not invented for many years after Christ. Which to me seemeth to be all one, as to deny sinews to a body : or to keep an infant unswaddled, and to suffer him to turn and bend any way, till he grow out of fashion. For mine own satisfaction I am fully resolved, that the letters and vowels of the Hebrew were,—as the soul and body of a child,—knit together at their conception and beginning ; and that they had both one author.

1. For, first, a tongue cannot be learned without vowels, though, at last, skill and practice may make it to be read without. Grammar, and not nature, makes men to do this, and this also helped out with the sense of the place we read.

2. That Masorites should amend that, which the Septuagint could not see,—and that they should read righter than the other, who were of far greater authority,—I cannot believe.

3. Our Saviour, in his words of one ‘Iota’ and one small keraia (*tittle*) not perishing from the law, seems to allude to the least of the letters, Jod, and the least vowel and accent.

4. Lastly, It is above the skill of a mere man to point the Bible ; nay, scarcely a verse, as it is. The ten commandments may puzzle all the world for that skill.

CHAP. XXXII.

Of the Language of the two Testaments.

THE two Testaments, are like the apostles at Jerusalem (when the confusion of tongues at Babel was recompensed with multiplicity of tongues at Sion), speaking in different languages, but speaking both to one purpose. They differ from each other only in language and time : but, for matter, the New is veiled in the Old, and the Old re-veiled in the New.

Isaiah^y, in his vision, heard the seraphins cry, "Zeh el zeh," one to another; "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Sabaoth." So the two Testaments, like these two seraphins, cry, "Zel el zeh," one to another; the Old cries to the New, and the New echoes to the Old. The Old cries, "Holy is the Lord, that hath promised;" the New answers, "Holy is the Lord, that hath performed." The Old says, "Holy is the Father, that gave the law;" the New saith, "Holy is the Son, that preached the gospel:" and both say, "Holy is the Holy Ghost, that penned both law and gospel, to make men holy." The two cherubins^z, in Solomon's temple, stood so, that, with their outmost wings, they touched the sides of the house, and their other wings touched each other. So the two Testaments, one way, touch the two sides of the house,—and, the other way, touch each other. In their extent, they reach from the beginning of the world to the end; from "in the beginning," to "come, Lord Jesus." In their consent, they touch each other, with "He shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children^a," and "He shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children^b." Here the two wings join in the middle. Tertullian calls the prophet Malachi, "the bound" or skirt "of Judaism and Christianity;" a stake that tells, that there promising ends, and performing begins,—that prophesying concludes, and fulfilling takes place: there is not a span between these two plots of holy ground, the Old and New Testament,—for they touch each other. What do the Papists, then, when they put and chop in the Apocrypha, for canonical Scripture, between Malachi and Matthew, law and gospel,—what do they, but make a wall between the seraphins, that they cannot hear each other's cry? What do they, but make a stop between the cherubins, that they cannot touch each other's wing? What do they, but make a ditch betwixt these grounds, that they cannot reach each other's coasts? What do they, but remove the land-mark of the Scriptures, and so are guilty of "cursed be he, that removes his neighbour's mark^c?" And what do they, but divorce the marriage of the Testaments, and so are guilty of the breach of "that which God hath joined together, let no man put asunder?" These two Testaments are the two paps of the church, from which we suck "the sincere milk of the word." One pap is not more

^y Isa. vi. 2. ^z 2 Chron. iii. ^a Mal. iv. 6. ^b Luke, i. 17. ^c Dent. xxvii. 17.

like to another, than are these two, for substance ; but, for language, they vary in colour. The Old (as all can tell) is written in Hebrew ; but some foreign languages are also admitted into Scripture, besides the Hebrew ; as foreign nations were to be admitted also into the church, besides the Hebrews. A great piece of Ezra is Chaldee, because taken from Chaldee chronicles. Those parts of Daniel's visions that concern all the world, are written in the Chaldee,—the tongue then best known in the world, because the Chaldeans were then lords of the world. The eleventh verse of the tenth of Jeremiah is in the same tongue ; that the Jews might learn so much of their language, as to refuse their idolatry in their own language. Other words of this idiom are frequent in the Scripture ; as I take two names given to Christ,—as ' Bar' the Son^d ; and ' Hhoter,' the rod^e of Jesse's stem^f, to be natively Chaldee words ; and for that they do show the greater mystery : viz. that this Son and this rod should belong to Chaldeans and Gentiles, as well as to Jew or Hebrews. Infinite it is, to trace all of this nature and language. The Arabian is also admitted into Scripture, especially in the book of Job, a man of that country. Whether Philistine phrases, and other adjacent nations' dialects, be not to be found there also,—I refer to the reader to search, and (I think) he may easily find. Of the eloquence of some pieces above others, and the difficulty of some books above others, those that can even read the English Bible, can tell. I would there were more, that could read it in its own language, and, as it were, talk with God there in his own tongue : that as, by God's mercy, Japheth dwells now in the tents of Shem, or the Gentiles have gained the pre-eminence of the Jews for religion,—so they would water this grafting of theirs into this stock, with the juice of that tongue, thereby to " provoke them the more to jealousy."

CHAP. XXXIII.

Of the New Testament Language ; or, the Greek.

THE Greek tongue is the key, which God used to unlock the tents of Shem to the sons of Japheth. " This glorious tongue" (as Tully calls it) is made most glorious by the writing of the New Testament in this language. God

^d Psal. ii. 10.

^e Hhutra, used by all the Targums for ' a rod,' in divers places.

^f Isa. xi.

hath honoured all the letters, by naming himself after the first and the last: as Homer shows the receipt of all the Grecian ships, by showing how many the greatest, and how few the least, contained^f. Javan is held, both by Jews and Christians, to have planted the country. The tongue is likely to be maternal from Babel. The Jews, upon Genesis the forty-ninth, think, that Jacob curseth his sons Simeon and Levi's fact, in one word of Greek, 'Macherothehem,' that is, μάχαιραι αὐτῶν, "their swords;" but all the Chaldees, and other translations, render it better, "their habitations^g." The ancientest heathen Greek, alive, is Homer; though the tongue was long before: and Homer's subject of Ilias, was treated of in Greek verse, by Evander's wife, of Arcadia, as some have related. Homer watered the tongue, and, in succeeding ages, it flourished, till it grew ripe in the New Testament. The dialects of it familiarly known to be five: the Attic, the Ionic, &c. The Macedonian was something strange, as appears in Clemens Alexandrinus^h; especially their 'devout Macedonian,' or about their orisons. How God scattered and divulged this tongue of the Greeks over the world, against the coming of Christ, and writing of the New Testament, is remarkable. Alexander the Great, with his Macedonians, made the eastern parts Grecian. The Old Testament, at Ptolemy's request, translated into Greek, was as an usher to bring in the New Testament, when Japheth should come to dwell in the tents of Shem. The Jews used to keep a mournful fast for that translation; but, as Jews mourn, so have Gentiles cause to rejoice. In like sort, for the preparation for the gospel of late (which, as far as antichrist's power could reach, lay depressed, but not overwhelmed), the Greek tongue, at the sacking of Constantinople by the Turks, was sent into these western climates, that we might hear Christ speak in his own language, without an Egyptian to interpret to us, as Joseph had to his brethren. What need we now to rely upon a Latin foundation, when we have the Greek purity? Never did the Turk any good to Christianity, but this, and this against his will: but God worketh all things for his own glory: and we may say of the poor inhabitants of Græcia, as of the Jews, "by their impoverishing, we are enriched."

As Athens, in old time, was called the 'Græcia of

^f Thucyd. lib. 1.

^g Gen. xlix. 5.

^h Strom. 5.

Græcia,'—so the New Testament, for language, may be styled the 'Greek of Greek.' In it (as upon the cross of our Saviour, in the title), are three tongues,—Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. Greek, the foundation; of the other two, some few additions. In the Greek, Master Broughton hath given learned rules and examples of the kinds of it; viz. Septuagint, Talmudic, Attic, and Apostolic. The Hebrew, or Syrian (for so that word, 'Hebrew,' in the title of the cross, must be understood) is easily found out, even in translations. Latin there is some, in the gospels, but not much: Κῆνσος, 'census,' for tribute; Κουστωδία, 'a ward,' or watchⁱ; Σπεκουλάτωρ, 'speculator^k;' which word is used by Targum Jerusalamy^l, of Potiphar, that he was 'Rabh Sapulachtaria;' 'Princeps speculatorum:' and some other words of the Latin tongue; which language, in our Saviour's time, the conquest of the Romans had scattered in Jerusalem, and in the parts adjoining; and so may one find some Latin in the Syrian Testament, and abundance of Greek.

CHAP. XXXIV.

Of the Chaldee and Syrian Tongues.

THE Chaldee and Syrian tongue was once all one, as appeareth in Gen. xxxi. 47; Ezra iv. 7; Dan. ii. 4. In character, indeed, they differed; they, of Babylon, using one kind of letter; they, of Syria, another: this was that, that nonplust the Babylonian wizards about the writing of the wall, so that they could not read it, though it were in their own language, because it was not in their own letter. In after-times, the very languages themselves began to vary; as the Chaldee, in Daniel, and Onkelos, and Jerusalamy^m, and Jonathan, and the Syrian in the Testament, do witness. The paraphrasts do much differ between themselves for purity of speech, and all fall short of the Bible-Chaldee. They are very full of Greek words; and so the Syrian,—a relic of Alexander's conquests. Some think they find some Greek in Daniel. Montanus himself renders 'Osphaia,' σοφοί, all along. Four kind of characters is the Chaldee to be had in; or, if you will, the Chaldee in two, and the Syrian in two. Our Bible, and paraphrasts' and Rabbins' Chaldee, is in the Hebrew letter; and the other kind of letter, is the Sa-

ⁱ Matt. xxviii. 11.

^k Mark, vi. 27.

^l In Gen. xxxvii.

^m i. e. The Jerusalem Talmud; Jerusalamy being derived from Hierosolymitanus.

maritan. The Syrian hath either a set letter, such as we have the New Testament imprinted in; or, their running-hand, such as the Maronites use in their writing, for speed: there is no great difference betwixt them, as you may see by their alphabet.

CHAP. XXXV.

Of the Arabian Language.

THIS is the most copious of the Hebrew dialects, and a tongue that may brag with the most of tongues, from fluency, and continuance of familiarity. This tongue is frequent in Scripture, especially in Job, a man of that country. How other parts of the Bible use it, I think may be judged by the nearness of Judea and Arabia, and of the two languages. In this one thing, it differs from its fellow-dialects, and its mother-tongue,—that it varieth terminations in declining of nouns, as the Greek and Latin do; and that it receiveth dual numbers, in forming verbs, as doth the Greek. Of the largeness of the alphabet, and difference from other alphabets, and quidditiesⁿ of the tongue, or, indeed, any thing of the tongue, I cannot say, which I have not received of the most industrious and thrice-learned (both in this and other the noble tongues) Master William Bedwell, whom I cannot name, without a great deal of thankfulness and honour; to whom I will rather be a scholar, than take on me to teach others. This tongue was Mahomet's Alcoran written in, and is still read in the same idiom, under pain of death, not to mistake a letter,—which is as easily done in this tongue, as in any.

CHAP. XXXVI.

Of the Latin Tongue.

THIS is the first idiom of our grammar-schools: a tongue, next the sacred tongues, most necessary for scholars of the best profession. Whether Latin were a Babel language, I will not controvert, 'pro et contra.' Sure, I dare say, that what Latin we read now, was not at Babel, if we may believe Polybius; who saith, that "the Latin tongue, that was used in Junius Brutus's time, was not understood in the time of the first Punic war, but only by great scholars." So much, in few years, it had degenerated. The old poets, compared with smooth Ovid and Tully, show much alteration. This spacious tongue, once almost as big as any,

ⁿ "De linguæ genio:" Leusden.

and as large as a great part of the world, is now bounded in schools and studies. The deluge of the north (the treasury of men) overwhelmed the Roman empire, scattered the men, and spoiled the Latin. Goths, Vandals, Lombards, and the rest of the brood of those frozen climates, have beaten the Latin tongue out of its own fashion, into the French, Spanish, and Italian. But some sparks of their hammering are flown into other languages of the west; so that most countries, hereabout, may own Rome for a second Babel, for their speech confused.

CHAP. XXXVII.

The Language of Britain near a thousand years ago. Ex Beda, lib. 1. de Hist. Angl. cap. 1.

“BRITANNIA in præsentī juxta numerum librorum,” &c. “Britain, in my time (saith Bede), doth search and confess one and the same knowledge of the high truth, and true sublimity, in five tongues, according to the five books wherein the law of God was written; namely, in the English, Britain, Scottish, Pict, and Latin tongues.” And, in the nineteenth chapter of the same book, he saith, that “when Austin, the monk, came from Gregory the Great, to preach the gospel in England, he brought with him interpreters out of France, to speak to the English.” That language, it seems, was then useful in England; but, whether the French that France speaks now, is a question. William the Conqueror took great care and pains to have brought in his tongue with his conquest, but could not prevail.

CHAP. XXXVIII.

Jonathan, the Chaldee Paraphrast's Conceit of Levi's choosing to the Priesthood; translated out of his Paraph. on Gen. xxxii. 24.

“AND Jacob was left alone beyond the ford; and an angel, in the likeness of a man, strove with him, and said, Didst thou not promise to give tithe of all that thou hadst? and, behold, thou hast twelve^m sons, and one daughter, and thou hast not tithed them: out of hand he sets apart the four first-born, to their four mothers” (for, saith the margin, they were holy, because of their primogeniture): “and then

^m He had but eleven sons as yet; but the Hebrew comment upon the Chaldee text helps out at this dead list, and saith, that Rachel was great with child of Benjamin, and so he is counted, before he is born.

were eight left: he begins again to count from Simeon, and ended in Levi,—for the tenth, or tithe. Michael answereth, and saith, Lord of the world, this is thy lot," &c; thus the Chaldee. On whose words, if they were worth commenting on, I could say more.

CHAP. XXXIX.

Of the Jews' Abbreviature, "עה

THIS short writing is common in all their authors. When they cite any of the doctors of their schools, they commonly use these words, "Ameru rabbothenu Zicronam libhracah;" in four letters, thus, ארזל; "Thus say our doctors, of blessed memory." But, when they speak of holy men, in the Old Testament, they usually take this phrase, "Gnalauhashalom," "on him is peace;" in brief, thus, ע"ה. Thus, when they mention Moses, Solomon, David, or others, this is the memorial they give them. The Arabians have the like use in their abbreviation of "Gnalahi alsalemo;" "on whom is peace." The words in Hebrew want a verb, and so may be construed two ways; "on him is peace," or, "on him be peace." The learned Master Broughton hath rendered it the former way, and his judgment herein shall be my law. To take it the latter way, seems to relish of Popish superstition, of praying for the dead; which though the Jews did not directly do, yet, in manner, they appear to do no less, in one part of their Common Prayer Book, called, "Mazkir neshamoth," 'the remembrancer of souls;' which, being not very long, I thought not amiss to translate out of their tongue into our own,—that the reader may see their Jewish Popery, or Popish Judaism, and may bless the Creator, who hath not shut us up in the same darkness.

CHAP. XL.

'Mazkir neshamoth;' or, 'the Remembrancer of Souls:' in the Jews' Liturgy, printed at Venice.

"THE Lord remember the soul (or spirit) of Abba Mr. N, the son of N, who is gone into his world: wherefore, I vow (to give) alms for him; that, for this, his soul may be bound up in the bundle of life, with the soul of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Sarah and Rebekah, Rachel and Leah, and with the rest of the righteous men and righteous women, which be in the garden of Eden."—Amen.

“ The Lord remember the soul of Mrs. N, the daughter of N, who is gone to her world : therefore, I vow,” &c; as in the other before.—Amen.

“ The Lord remember the soul of my father and my mother, of my grandfathers and grandmothers, of my uncles and aunts, brethren and sisters, of my cousins and cousinnesses, whether of my father’s side or mother’s side, who are gone into their world : wherefore, I vow,” &c.—Amen.

“ The Lord remember the soul of N, the son of N ; and the souls of all my cousins and cousinnesses, whether on my father’s or mother’s side, who were put to death, or slain, or stabbed, or burnt, or drowned, or hanged, for the sanctifying of the name of God : therefore, I will give alms for the memory of their souls ; and, for this, let their souls be bound up in the bundle of life, with the soul of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Sarah and Rebekah, Rachel and Leah, and with the rest of the righteous men and righteous women, which are in the garden of Eden.”—Amen.

Then the priest pronounceth a blessing upon the man, that is thus charitable ; as it followeth there, in these words :—

“ He that blessed our father, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Moses and Aaron, David and Solomon, he bless Rabbi N, the son of N, because he hath vowed alms for the souls, whom he hath mentioned : for the honour of God, and for the honour of the law, and for the honour of the day : for this the Lord keep him, and deliver him from all affliction and trouble, and from every plague and sickness ; and write him, and seal him, for a happy life, in the day of judgment ; and send a blessing, and prosper him in every work of his hands, and all Israel, his brethren ; and let us say, Amen.”

Thus, courteous reader, hast thou seen a Popish Jew interceding for the dead : have but the like patience a while, and thou shalt see how they are Popish almost entirely, in claiming the merits of the dead to intercede for them : for thus tendeth a prayer, which they use in the book, called, “ Sepher Min hagim shel col Hammedinoth,” &c ; which I have also here turned into English :—

“ Do, for thy praises’ sake. Do, for their sakes that loved thee, that (now) dwell in dust. For Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob’s sake. Do, for Moses and Aaron’s sake. Do, for David and Solomon’s sake. Do, for Jerusalem, thy holy

city's sake. Do, for Sion, the habitation of thy glory's sake. Do, for the desolation of thy temple's sake. Do, for the treading down of thine altar's sake. Do, for their sakes, who were slain for thy holy name. Do, for their sakes, who have been massacred for thy sake. Do, for their sakes, who have gone to fire or water, for the hallowing of thy name. Do, for sucking children's sakes, who have not sinned. Do, for weaned children's sakes, who have not offended. Do, for infants' sakes, who are of the house of our doctors. Do, for thine own sake, if not for ours. Do, for thine own sake, and save us."

Tell me, gentle reader, ἡ Πλάτων φιλονίζει, &c. whether doth the Jew Romanize, or the Roman Judaize, in his devotions? This interceding by others, is a shrewd sign they have both rejected the right "Mediator between God and man, Christ Jesus." The profane heathen might have read both Jew and Papist, a lecture in his "Contemno minutos istos Deos, modo Jovem propitium habeam;" which, I think, a Christian may well English, "Let go all diminutive divinities, so that I may have the great Jesus Christ to propitiate for me."

CHAP. XLI.

Of the Latin Translation of Matt. vi. 1.

ALMS, in Rabbin Hebrew, are called צדקה 'Tsedhakah,' 'righteousness;' which word the Syrian translator useth, Matt. vi. 1; Acts x. 2; and in other places. From this custom of speech, the Roman Vulgar translateth, "Attendite, ne justitiam vestram faciatis." One English old manuscript Testament, is in Litchfield library, which hath it thus, after the Latin; "Takith hede, that you do not your rightwisnes before men, to be seyne of hem, ellis ye shullen have no mede at your fadir, that is in hevenes." Other English translation, I never saw any to this sense; nor any Greek copy. It seems, the Papist will rather Judaize for his own advantage, than follow the true Greek. The Septuagint, in some places of the Old Testament, have turned 'Tsedhakah,' 'righteousness,' ἑλεημοσύνην, 'almsdeeds,' to little or to no sense; as the Papists have, in this place of the New Testament, turned ἑλεημοσύνην 'almsdeeds,' by δικαιοσύνην, 'righteousness,' to as little purpose. In the Hebrew, indeed, one word is used for both; 'Tsedhakah,'

for ‘ almsdeeds,’ which properly signifies ‘ righteousness ;’ upon what ground I know not, unless it be, to show that almsⁿ must be given of rightly gotten goods, or else they are no righteousness : or they are called ‘ Zadkatha,’ in Syrian, ‘ Hu ger zadek le mehwo,’ they are called righteousness, because it is right they should be given, and given rightly. The fathers of the council of Trent speak much of the merit of alms ; whom one may answer in the very words of their Vulgar, “ Attendite ne justitiam vestram faciatis ;” “ Take heed, you do not make them your justification.”

CHAP. XLII.

An Emblem.

A WALL in Rome had this picture :—A man, painted naked, with a whip in one hand,—and four leaves of a book in the other,—and, in every leaf, a word written. In the first, ‘ plango,’ ‘ I mourn ;’ in the second, ‘ dico,’ ‘ I tell ;’ in the third, ‘ volo,’ ‘ I will ;’ and, in the fourth, ‘ facio,’ ‘ I do.’ Such a one is the true repentant. He is naked, because he would have his most secret sins laid open to God : he is whipped, because his sins do sting himself : his book is his repentance : his four words are his actions : in the first, he mourns ; in the second, he confesses ; in the third, he resolves ; and, in the fourth, he performs his resolution. ‘ Plango,’ ‘ I mourn,’—there is sight of sin and sorrow ; ‘ dico,’ ‘ I tell,’—there is contrition for sin and confession ; ‘ volo,’ ‘ I will,’—there is amending resolution ; ‘ facio,’ ‘ I do,’—there is performing satisfaction.

CHAP. XLIII.

Mahanaim. Gen. xxxii. 2.

“ AND Jacob went on his way, and the angels of God met him : and Jacob said, when he saw them, This is the host of the Lord : and he called the name of the place Mahanaim.”

The word is dual, and tells of two armies, and no more. What these two armies were, the Jews, according to their usual vein, do find strange expositions. To omit them all, this seems to me to be the truth and reason of the name. There was one company with Jacob, which afterward he calls his army ; and there was another company of angels,

ⁿ St. Chrysostom hath such a touch.

which he calls ‘the army of God.’ These are the two armies, that gave name to Mahanaim; two armies, one heavenly, and the other earthly; and from this, I take it, Solomon compares the church^o “to the company of Mahanaim:” for so the church consisteth of two armies; one heavenly, like these angels, which is the church triumphant,—and the other, travelling on earth, like Jacob’s army, which is the church militant.

CHAP. XLIV.

The Book of Psalms.

THE Psalms are divided into five books, according to the five books of Moses: and if they be so divided, there be seventy books in the Bible: the unskilful may find, where any one of these five books end; by looking where a Psalm ends with ‘Amen,’ there also ends the book. As, at Psal. xli. lxxii. lxxxix. cvi; and from thence to the end.

These may, even in their very beginnings, be harmonized to the books of the law.

Genesis. The First Book of Moses telleth, how happiness was lost, even by Adam’s walking in wicked counsel of the serpent and the woman.

Psalm i. The First Book of Psalms tells, how happiness may be regained, if a man ‘do not walk in wicked counsel,’ as of the serpent and woman, the devil and the flesh.

This allusion of the First Book Arnobius makes.

Exodus. The Second Book of Moses tells of groaning affliction in Egypt.

Psalm xlii. The Second Book of Psalms begins in groaning affliction; Psal. xlii. 43.

Leviticus. The Third Book of Moses is of giving the law.

Psalm lxxiii. The Third Book of Psalms tells, in the beginning, how good God is for giving this law. This allusion, Rab. Tanch. makes very near.

Numbers. The Fourth Book of Moses is about numbering.

Psalm xc. The Fourth Book begins with numbering, of the best arithmetic: numbering God’s mercy (Psal. xc. 1) and our own days (ver. 12).

^o Cant. vi. 12.

Deuteronomy. The last Psalm cvii. So is the last Book of Moses is a rehearsal of all. Book of the Psalms, from Psalm cvii to the end.

In the Jews' division of the Scripture, this piece of the Psalms, and the books of the like nature, are set last: not because they be of the least dignity; but because they be of least dependance with other books; as, some of them being no story at all,—and some, stories and books of lesser bulk, and so set in a form by themselves. The Old Testament books, the Jews acrostically do write thus, in three letters, אֵנֶךְ or תֵּנֶךְ, every letter standing for a word, and every word for a part of the Bible. א or ת for 'Aorajetha,' or 'Torah,' 'the law:' נ for 'נְבִיאִים,' the 'prophets:' כ for 'כְּתוּבִים,' or 'books of holy writ' (ἁγιογرافα). This division is so old, that our Saviour himself useth it in the last chapter of Luke, ver. 44; "All things, written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and the Psalms;" by 'the Psalms' meaning, that part of Cethubhim, in which the Psalms are set first.

CHAP. XLV.

Of the Creation.

Two ways we come to the knowledge of God,—by his works and by his word. By his works, we come to know there is a God; and by his word, we come to know what God is. His works teach us to spell; his word teacheth us to read. The first are, as it were, his back parts, by which we behold him afar off; the latter shows him to us face to face. The world is as a book consisting of three leaves; and every leaf printed with many letters, and every letter a lecture. The leaves, heaven, the air, and earth, with the water. The letters in heaven, every angel, star, and planet; In the air, every meteor and soul; In the earth and waters, every man, beast, plant, fish, and mineral. All these set together, spell to us, that there is a God; and the apostle saith no less, though in less space; "For the invisible things of him^p, that is, his eternal power and Godhead, are seen by the creation of the world, being considered in his works^q." And so David^r. It is not for nothing, that God hath set the cabinet of the universe open; but it is, because he hath given us eyes to behold his treasure. Neither is it for nothing, that he hath given us eyes

^p In the Syrian translation, it is 'the hid things of God.'

^q Rom. i. 20.

^r Psal. xix. 1.

to behold his treasure ; but because he hath given us hearts to admire upon our beholding. If we mark not the works of God,—we are like stones, that have no eyes, wherewith to behold. If we wonder not at the works of God, when we mark them,—we are like beasts, that have no hearts wherewith to admire. And if we praise not God for his works, when we admire them,—we are like devils, that have no tongues, wherewith to give thanks. Remarkable is the story of the poor old man, whom a bishop found most bitterly weeping over an ugly toad : being asked the reason of his tears, his answer was, “ I weep, because, that whereas God might have made me as ugly and filthy a creature as this toad, and hath not,—I have yet never, in all my life, been thankful to him for it.” If the works of the creation would but lead us to this one lecture, our labour of observing them were well bestowed. How much more, when they lead us far farther !

CHAP. XLVI.

The Time and Manner of the Creation.

MOSES, in the first verse of the Bible, refutes three heathen opinions : namely, theirs, that thought the world was eternal ; for he saith, “ In the beginning,” &c. Secondly, Theirs, that thought there was no God ; for he saith, “ Elohim created.” Thirdly, Theirs, that thought there were many Gods,—for he saith^s, ‘ Elohim,’ he created heaven and earth. The first word, “ In the beginning,” may draw our minds and thoughts to the last thing, the latter end ; and this thought must draw our affections from too much love of the world,—for it must have an end, as it had a beginning. I will not stand to comment upon the word ‘ Bereshith,’ ‘ in the beginning ;’ for then, I know not when to come to an end. To treat how the divers expositors labour about the beginning of the world, is a world of labour. How the Jerusalem Targum translates it, ‘ In wisdom ;’ and is followed by Rabbi Tanchum, and many Jews : how Targ. Jonath. useth an Arabian word, “ Min awwala,” “ a primo ;”—Onkelos, “ in primis,” or “ in prin-

^s Even those that have not Hebrew, can tell there is a mystery of the Trinity in ברא אלהים ; but few mark, how sweetly this is answered with the same phrase in manner, in the Haphtara, which is read by the Jews, to this portion of Moses ; viz. Isa. xlii. 5, בורא השמים ונוטיהם : ‘ Jehovah’ being singular, and ‘ notehem,’ plural ; which might be rendered, ‘ Deus creans cœlos, et Deus extendentes eos.’

cipio ;” Jarchi, “in principio creationis creavit :” how Basil the Great, St. Ambrose, and hundreds others, do interpret this,—is a work endless to examine. Satisfied am I with this, that the world and all things had their beginning from God, that, in the beginning, created heaven and earth. Some of the Jews do invert the word ‘Bereshith,’ and make it ‘Betisri;’ that is, ‘in the month Tisri,’ was the world created. This month is about our September; and that the world was created in this month (to let other reasons alone), this satisfies me,—that the feast of tabernacles, which was in this month, is called the end of the year^t: and this I take to be the reason, why the Jews began to read the Bible in their synagogues, at the feast of tabernacles; viz. that they might begin the lecture of the creation, in Gen. i, at that time of the year that the world was created.

The manner of the creation shows the workman powerful and wise. The making of the angels concealed by Moses, lest men should (like those heretics in Epiphanius) think they helped God in the creation. For if the day of their creation (which was, in most likelihood, the first^u) had been named, wicked men would have been ready to have taken them for actors in this work, which were only spectators. Therefore, as God hides Moses after his death,—so Moses hides the creation of them, lest they should be deified; and the honour, due to the Creator, given to the creature. God, in framing the world, begins above, and works downward; and, in three days, he lays the parts of the world; and, in the three other days, he adorns those parts.

The first day, he makes all the heavens, the matter of the earth, and comes down so low as the light.

The second, lower, and makes the firmament, or air.

The third, lowest of all, and makes distinction of earth and water.

Thus, in three days, the parts, or body, of the world is laid; in three days more, and in the same order, they are furnished. For on

The fourth day, the heavens, which were made the first day, are decked with stars.

The fifth day, the firmament, which was made the second day, is filled with birds.

^t Exod. xxiii. 16.

^u R. Solomon holds, they were made the second day. Many divines hold for the fourth

The sixth day, the earth, which was laid fit the third day, is replenished with beasts,—and, lastly, man^v.

Thus God, in the six days, finished all his work of creation^w. For the ten things, that, the Chaldee paraphrast saith, God created on the evening of the sabbath, after the world was finished,—I refer them to their authors to believe them.

R. Jarchi, on Gen. ii, observes, that God created one day superior things,—and another day, inferior: his words are to this purpose:—

“On the first day, he created heaven above, and earth beneath: On the second day, the firmament above: On the third, let the dry land appear beneath: On the fourth day, lights above: On the fifth day, let the waters bring forth beneath: On the sixth, he must create both superior and inferior, as he had done on the first, lest there should be confusion in his work;—therefore, he made man of both, his soul from above, and his body from beneath.”

R. Tanchumah shows, how the making of the tabernacle harmonizeth with the making of the world: the light of the first day is answered by the candlestick; for light was the first work; and the spreading of the firmament, like a curtain, is answered by the curtains, the second work; and so of the rest.

Every one knows the old conceit of the world's lasting six thousand years, because it was made in six days: and of Elias's prophecy among the Jews, of the world's ending at the end of six thousand: which prophecy of his, is flat against the words of Christ. Many believe these opinions; yet few prepare for the end, which, they think, is so near.

God hath taught us, by the course of the creation of the old world, what our proceedings must be, that we may become a new creation, or new heavens, and a new earth, renewed both in soul and body.

1. On the first day, he made the light,—so the first thing in the new man must be light of knowledge; so saith St. Paul^x, “He that cometh to God, must know that he is.”

2. On the second day, he made the firmament, so called, because of its sureness^y; so the second step in man's new

^v The seventy interpreters on Gen. ii. 2, instead of ‘God had finished on the seventh day,’ read ‘he finished on the sixth day.’

^w Chaldee Paraph. on Num. xxii. and Jarchi. on Deut. xxxiv. and Pirke Aboth.

^x Heb. xi.

^y *Χάλκεον ἐστὸς*, in Hesiod; *οὐρανὸς πολύχαλκος*, Hom. Odys. 3.

creation, must be 'Firmamentum fidei,' the sure 'foundation of faith.'

3. On the third day, the seas and trees bearing fruit: so, the third step in the new man is, that he become waters of repentant tears, and that he bringeth forth fruit worthy of these tears. "Bring forth fruit worthy of repentance," saith the Baptist^z.

4. On the fourth day, God created the sun: that whereas, on the first day, there was light, but without heat; now, on the fourth day, there is light and heat joined together. So the fourth step in the new creation of a new man is, that he join the heat of zeal, with the light of his knowledge: as, in the sacrifices, fire and salt were ever joined.

5. The fifth day's work, was of fishes, to play in the seas,—and of the fowls, to fly towards heaven: so the fifth step, in a new creature, is, to live and rejoice in a sea of troubles,—and to fly, by prayer and contemplation, to heaven.

6. On the sixth day, God makes man: and, all these things performed, man is a new creature. To reckon them altogether, then, as St. Peter does his golden chain of virtues^a, "Add to your light of knowledge, the firmament of faith; to your faith, seas of repentant tears; to your tears, the fruitful trees of good works; to your good works, the hot sunshine of zeal; to your zeal, the winged fowls of prayer and contemplation; et ecce omnia facta sunt nova. Behold, you are become a new creature."

As the Bible begins, so it ends, with a new creation of a new heaven, and a new earth, and a new paradise, and a new tree of life^b; unto all which, "O thou, whom my soul loveth, say, Come."

CHAP. XLVII.

Of the Fall of Adam.

THE^c fall of Adam was the death of himself, the death of us, and the death of Christ. At his fall, were three offenders, three offences, and persons offended. Three offenders, Satan, Adam, Eve: three offences, ignorance, weakness, and malice: three persons offended, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Eve sinned of ignorance, and so sinned against the Son, the God of knowledge, and she was forgiven; and so St. Paul sinned

^z Matt. iii.

^a 2 Pet. i.

^b Apoc. xxi.

^c Cypriano di Valera.

and was forgiven^d. Adam sinned of weakness, and so sinned against the Father, the God of power, and he was pardoned; and so St. Peter sinned, and he was pardoned^e. But Satan sinned of set malice, and so sinned against the Holy Ghost, the God of love, and he was not forgiven: "For he that speaketh against the Holy Ghost, shall never be forgiven^f." And, in God's censuring of these three^g, he questioneth Adam and Eve before he sentenceth, because he had mercy for them; nay, more, he promiseth Christ, before he inflict punishment: but, for the serpent, he never questioned, because he would show him no mercy. God left Adam to his own free-will, and suffered him to fall, because he knew how to turn that fall of his, to his salvation. When Lazarus died, Christ was not there, that the raising of Lazarus, by Christ, might be the more glorious; so, when Adam fell (as I may say so), God would not be there (for he left Adam to his own free-will), that the repairing of Adam, through Christ, might be the more glorious. Hereupon, one sings, "O felix lapsus!" Unhappy was the fall of Adam, since by his fall we all fell; but yet happy was that unhappy fall, since it must be recured by Christ. Joseph suffered his brother Simeon to go into prison for a while; that, at last, he might bring him out with greater comfort: so God suffered Adam to go into Satan's Newgate for a while, that, at last, he might bring him out with greater comfort. "The day thou eatest hereof, thou shalt die,"—there is the prison; "and the man took and ate,"—there Adam goes into prison: "The seed of the woman shall break the head of the serpent,"—there Joseph delivers Simeon out of prison, God brings man out of hell, through Christ. Whereupon, a doctor, in admiration, questions, "*utrum mirabilius, homines justos creare, an injustos justificare?*" "whether is more admirable, that God created man righteous, or that he justified man, when he had made himself unrighteous?" Whether was more miraculous, for God to make man of nothing, or to repair him from worse than nothing? Wonderful he was in both,—in his first and his second creation: for "*justificatio est secunda hominis creatio;*" "man's justification is his new creation."

^d 1 Tim. i. 13.^e Matt. xxvi.^f Mark, iii. 29.^g Gen. iii.

CHAP. XLVIII.

Ophitæ; Evia.

SOME heretics, in Epiphanius, think themselves beholden to the devil, for his pains that he took to overthrow Adam: for they used to worship a serpent, because (say they) he brought knowledge into the world. Clemens Alexandrinus doth partly think, this conceit was got among the heathens: who, at their feasts of Bacchus, used to carry a serpent, as it were, in procession, and to cry, ‘Evia, Evia.’ Εὐία δὲ δασυρόμενον, &c. And Evia, saith Clemens, if it be aspirated Hevia, signifies, in the Hebrew tongue, ‘a female serpent.’ Where the good man calls the Chaldee tongue, the Hebrew: for, in the Hebrew, I do not find such a word for a serpent: but all the Chaldee translations of the Bible, in the third of Genesis, and divers other places, do use the word חַיָּה for a serpent: which I take to be the word he means.

CHAP. XLIX.

Of the Greek Translation of the fifth of Genesis.

How the Septuagint does add hundreds of years to men’s ages, before and after the flood, few scholars but they know. This bred the difference of computation of the times,—while some followed the Hebrew, some the Greek:—hence came two notorious doubts: About Methuselah’s living after the flood, who died a month or two before; And of Shem’s death before Abraham’s birth, who lived as long after Abraham came to Canaan, as Abraham was old, when he came thither; viz. seventy-five years: and so might well be Melchisedek. The Greeks had a great deal of stir, where to put Methuselah all the flood-time, for fear of drowning: at last, some laid him on the top of Noah’s ark, and there he was all that watery year. The Jews lay Og, the giant, there, also; as the Chaldee paraphrast, upon the fourteenth of Genesis, ridiculously observeth; whose words, for your fuller sport, I will not spare to set down. The thirteenth verse he renders thus, in Chaldee: “And Og came, who was left of those, that died in the flood: for he rode upon the ark, and was as a covering upon it, and was nourished with Noah’s victuals: but he was not preserved for his own sake or merit, but that the inhabitants of the world might see the power of the Lord,

and say, Did not the giants, in old time, rebel against the Lord of the world, and he destroyed them from the earth? Yet as soon as these kings make war, behold, Og is with them. Og saith with himself,—I will go and show Abraham Lot's case, that he is taken prisoner; that so he may come to rescue him, and may himself fall into their hands. He goes, and comes to him about the Passover-day, and finds him making unleavened cakes; then he told Abraham the Hebrew," &c. Thus far the Chaldee, of whose conceits here, and in one thousand of places more, and so of his nation, the Jews,—I know not whether to say, 'Risum,' or 'fletum teneatis, amici?' But to return to my purpose. The Greek Bible makes Methuselah live fourteen^h years after the flood: their reason of this their addition of years, many render, which I omit. But St. Austinⁱ saith, some fall short of this man's age: "In three Greek books (saith he), and one Latin, and one Syrian book, all agreeing one with another, Methuselah is found to die six years before the flood." Such differences may incite men to apply themselves to the Hebrew text, where is no falsifying nor error.

CHAP. L.

*Upon the Words, 'The seed of the woman shall break
the serpent's head'^j.*

THE New Testament affords a rich commentary upon these words, in the Gospel of St. Luke; who, in his third chapter, shows, how, through seventy-five generations, Christ is this seed of the woman; and, in the fourth chapter, how, through three temptations, this seed began to bruise the head of the serpent: where the reader may observe, how the devil tempts Christ, in the very same manner, that he had tempted Eve, though not with the same success. All the sins of the world are brought by St. John^k, to these three heads,—'Lust of the flesh,' 'lust of the eyes,' and 'the pride of life.' By these three, Eve falls in the garden: she sees the tree is good for meat; and the lust of the flesh enticeth her: she sees it fair to look on; and the lust of the eye provokes her: and she perceives it will make her wise; and the pride of life persuades her to take it. By these three,

^h The Chaldee paraphrase of Jonathan, does also mistake in the age of Methuselah; but I think it only false printing.

ⁱ Civ. Dei, lib. 15. cap. 13.

^j Jerusalem and Babylonian Targums do both apply these words to the Messias.

^k 1 John, ii. 16.

the devil tempts Christ; when he is hungry, he would have him turn stones into bread, and so tries him by the lusts of the flesh: he shows, and promiseth him, all the pomp of the world, and so tries him by the lust of the eyes: and he will have him to fly in the air; and so tempts him to pride of life. But as, by these three, the serpent had broken the head of the woman,—so, against these three, the seed of the woman breaks the head of the serpent. David¹ prophesied of this conquest: “The dragon thou shalt tread under thy feet.” The very next verse before this, the devil useth to tempt Christ withal: but to this, he dare not come; for it is to his sorrow.

CHAP. LI.

Jewish hypocritical Prayers, reproved by our Saviour, Matt. vi. 5; “Because they love to stand praying in the synagogues, and corners of the streets.”

THIS sermon upon the mount, is much in reproof of the Jews’ Talmudical traditions, by which they made the word of God of none effect. This verse reproveth one of their tenets, for their highway orisons: for which, they have this tradition in their Talmud^m: “Rabbi Josi saith, On a time I was walking by the way, and I went into one of the deserts of Jerusalem to pray: then came Elias, of blessed memoryⁿ, and watched me at the gate, and stayed for me, till I had ended my prayer. After that I had ended my prayer, he saith unto me, Peace be unto thee, Rabbi; I said unto him, Peace be upon thee, Rabbi, and master^o. Then said he to me, My son, wherefore wentest thou into this desert? I said unto him, To pray. He said to me, Thou mightest have prayed in the way. Then said I, I was afraid, lest passengers would interrupt me. He said unto me, Thou shouldest have prayed a short prayer. At that time, I learned of him three things; I learned, that we should not go into the desert; and I learned, that we should pray by the way; and learned, that he that prayed by the way, must pray a short prayer.” Thus far, their Talmud maketh them these letters-patents for hypocrisy; fathering this bastard upon blessed Elias, who was not a highway prayer,

¹ Psal. xci. 13.

^m In Sepher Beracoth.

ⁿ Heb. Zachur lattob, ‘Remembered for good.’ ^o Heb. Mori, which, in the Chaldee and Syrian, signifieth, a ‘Lord,’ or ‘Master:’ hence is Maran-atha, ‘our Lord cometh,’ the great excommunication, 1 Cor. xvi. 22.

or one that practised his own devotions in public; for he was John Baptist's type, for retiredness.

CHAP. LII.

Israel's Affliction in Egypt.

OF Israel's being in Egypt, many heathen authors do touch,—though every one, a several way,—and all of them, the wrong. Josephus against Apion is angry at their fables about it. As to the famine that brought them thither (if we take the want of Nilus's^o flowing to be the natural cause, as, most like, it was), there seems then to be some remembrance of those seven years in Seneca, in his Natural Questions; where he saith, “Per novem annos Nilum non ascendisse superioribus sæculis, Callimachus est auctor;” that is, “Callimachus writes, that, in old time, Nilus flowed not of nine years together:” where he outstrips but two of the number. But of Israel's affliction in Egypt, I find the heathens silent. God had told Abraham of this their hardship long before, and showed him a token of it, by the fowls' lighting upon his carcasses^p. A type of Israel's being in Egypt, and of Pharaoh's being plagued for their sakes, was, when Pharaoh suffered, for taking Sarah from her husband, and keeping her in his house^q. How long they were in that land, few there be but know: but how long their affliction lasted, is uncertain. Probable it is, that he was about a hundred and twenty years,—the time of the old world's repentance, and Moses's age. This is to be searched by Levi's age, which, within a little, one may find certain. All the generation of Joseph's time die, before they are afflicted: as all the generation of Joshua's time die, before they fall to idolatry^r. The reasons why God should thus suffer them to suffer,—whether it were to fit them for the receiving of him and his law,—or whether it were to whip them for their idolatry;—or for some other cause,—I dare not enter too near to search: this I see, that, when the foundation (as it

^o Nilus, the wonder of Afric, the river of Egypt, flows every year once over his banks: and, if it flow not at all, or not to his right height, it causeth famine; for Egypt hath no rain. From this river, under God, comes their plenty, or famine; and it is remarkable, that the fat and lean kine in Pharaoh's dream (which betokened the plenty or scarcity of the country), came out of the river. Of the reason of the flowing of this river, Pigaffetta, especially, is large. And I wonder, that Jordan was not as much wondered at; for it did so also, Josh. i.

^p Gen. xv.

^q Gen. xii.

^r Judg. ii. 10.

were) of the visible church is laid thus in affliction, the church cannot but look for affliction, whilst it lives in the Egypt of this world. But, as Israel increased under persecution; so does the church: for even when “*sparsum est semen sanguinis martyrum, surrexit seges ecclesiæ: Nec frustra oravit ecclesia pro inimicis suis, qui oderunt eam, et qui persequabantur*.” To omit the Jews’ fancy, that ‘the Israelitish women bare six at a birth;’ and to omit questioning whether ‘*foetifer Nilus*,’ the drinking of the water of Nilus, which, as some say, is good for generation, did conduce to the increasing of Israel,—I can only look at God, and his work, which did thus multiply and sustain them in the furnace of affliction. “*Si Deus nobiscum, quis contra nos?*” God had promised this increase to Jacob, as he fled to Haran^t, in a dream from the top of Jacob’s ladder. And here he proves “faithful, who had promised.”

CHAP. LIII.

Israel’s Camp: according to the Chaldee Paraphrast’s Description. Num. ii.

THE Chaldee is precise about pitching Israel’s camp. I have not thought much to translate a whole chapter out of him, that the reader may see, at the least, his will,—if not his truth.

Num. ii. 1. “And the Lord spake to Moses and to Aaron, saying,

2. Every one of the children of Israel shall pitch by his standard, by the ensigns whereto they are appointed; by the standards of their fathers shall they pitch over against the tabernacle of the congregation, round^u about.

3. The camp of Israel was twelve miles long, and twelve miles broad: and they that pitched eastward, towards the sun-rising, the standard of the camp of Judah, four miles square; and his ensign was of three party-colours, like the three pearls that were in the breast-plate (or rational), the ruby, topaz, and carbuncle; and in it were deciphered and expressed the names of three tribes, ‘Judah, Issachar, Zebulun;’ and in the middle was written קומה יהוה

וּפְצוּ אוֹיְבֵיךָ וַיִּנְסוּ מִשְׁנֹאֵיךָ מִפְּנֵיךָ

^s Aust. Ser. de Temp. 109.

^t Gen. xxviii.

^u Chald. ‘round, round.’

‘ Arise, O Lord, and let thine enemies be scattered ; and let them that hate thee, flee before thee.’ And in it was drawn the picture of a lion’s whelp, for the prince of the children of Judah, Nahshon, the son of Amminadab.

4. And his host and the number of them, seventy-four thousand and six hundred.

5. And they that pitched next him, the tribe of Issachar ; and the prince that was over the army of the tribe of the sons of Issachar, Nethaneel, the son of Zuar.

6. And his army and the number of his tribes, fifty-four thousand and four hundred.

7. The tribe of Zebulun, and the prince that was set over the army of the tribe of the sons of Zebulun, Eliab, the son of Elon.

8. And the army and their number of his tribe, fifty-seven thousand and four hundred.

9. All the number of the host of Judah were^u one hundred eighty-six thousand and four hundred, by their armies ; they went first.

10. The standard of the host of Reuben shall pitch southward, by their armies, four miles square ; and his ensign was of three party-colours, like the three stones in the breast-plate, the emerald, sapphire, and diamond ; and in it were deciphered and expressed the names of three tribes, ‘ Reuben, Simeon, Gad ;’ and in the middle was written thus :—

שמע ישראל יהוה אלהינו יהוה אחד

‘ Hear, O Israel ; the Lord our God is one Lord.’ And in it was drawn the picture of a young hart : but there should have been drawn in it a bullock ; but Moses the prophet changed it, because he would not put them in mind of their sin about the calf. And the prince, that was set over the host of the tribe of Reuben, was Elizur, the son of Shedeur.

12. And his host and the number of his tribe, fifty-nine thousand and three hundred^v.

13. And the tribe of Gad ; and the prince, that was set over the host of the tribe of Gad, Eliasaph, the son of Reuel.

^u The Chaldee numbers otherwise, but it is misprinting : therefore, I take the Hebrew.

^v The Chaldee misseth the eleventh and fourteenth verses.

15. And his host, and the number of his tribe^w, forty-five thousand and six hundred.

16. All the number of the host of Reuben, one hundred fifty-one thousand four hundred and fifty, by their armies: they went second.

17. Then went the tabernacle of the congregation, and the host of the Levites in the camps, and their camp was four miles square. They went in the middle; as they pitched, so they went, every one in his rank, according to his standard.

18. The standard of the camp of Ephraim, by their hosts, pitched westward; and their camp was four miles square; and his ensign was of three party-colours, like the three stones in the breast-plate,—a turquoise, an agate, and an amethyst; and in it were deciphered and expressed the names of three tribes, 'Ephraim, Manasseh, and Benjamin;' and in the middle was written,

וענן עליהם ביום &c.

'And the cloud of the Lord was upon them by day, when they went out of the camp:' and in it was drawn the picture of a child. And the prince, that was set over the army of the children of Ephraim, was Elishama, the son of Ammihud.

19. And his host, and the number of his tribe, forty thousand and five hundred.

20. And next him the tribe of Manasseh; and the prince, which was set over the host of the tribe of the children of Manasseh, Gamaliel, the son of Pedahzur.

21. And his host, and their number of his tribe, thirty-two thousand and two hundred.

22. And the tribe of Benjamin; and the prince, that was set over the host of the tribe of the children of Benjamin, Abidan, the son of Gideon.

23. And his host, and their number of his tribe, thirty-five thousand and four hundred.

24. All the number of the camp of Ephraim, one hundred eighty thousand and one hundred, by their armies; and they went in the third place.

25. The standard of the camp of Dan, northward, and their camp four miles square: and his ensign was of three party-colours, according to the three stones in the breast-plate, a chrysolite, onyx, and jasper; and in it were deci-

^w The Chaldee cometh short of the right number.

phered and expressed the names of three tribes, 'Dan, Naph-tali, Asher;' and in the midst was written and expressed,

ובנחה יאמר שובה יהוה רבבות אלפי ישראל

'And when it rested, he said, Return, O Lord, to the ten thousand of Israel.' And in it was drawn the figure of a serpent, or arrow-snake: and the prince, that was set over the host of the children of Dan, Ahiezer, the son of Ammi-shaddai."—From thence, to the end of the chapter, he goes on just with the Hebrew text, so that I will spare farther labour about translating: only, I must tell the reader thus much, that the pearls he speaks of, I have not punctually followed the Chaldee, in rendering their names, but have followed the Geneva Bible, which was, at that instant, the only English Bible about me. As, also, for perfect and future tense, I find the Chaldee confused; and for this I have been the less curious.

CHAP. LIV.

Of Job.

ABOUT Israel's being in Egypt, Job lives in Arabia; a heathen man, and yet so good: and so St. Gregory saith, his "country is purposely named, that the goodness of the man may be the more illustrated." His times may be picked by the genealogy of himself, and his friends, that come to see him. And God, in the first and second chapter, saith, that "there was not a man on earth like him for goodness:" which is a sign, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and Joseph, were not alive, nor Moses: but in the times betwixt Joseph and Moses, Israel corrupt themselves with Egyptian idols, and in Israel (the likeliest place to find a good man in) is not one to be found like Job. Thus, when Israel idolizes, and the church begins to fail in Jacob, God hath one in Arabia, that hath a little church in his house. It is not amiss for every one, for his more watchfulness, to mark, that Satan knows Job, as soon as ever God speaks of him.

When the angels appear before God, Satan, the devil, is among them;—so, when the disciples are with Christ, Judas, a devil, is among them.

Pharaoh, in Egypt, is afflicted by God; his afflictions harden him against God:—Job, in Arabia, is afflicted by the devil; his afflictions harden him against the devil.

Job's children, feasting, overwhelmed by a house:—the Philistines, sporting, overwhelmed by a house^x.

Job is afflicted,—as the soldiers, 2 Kings i, by fire.

As the Ziklagites, 1 Sam. xxx, by captivity.

As the Egyptians, with loss of children, Exod. xii.

And, as the Egyptians, with biles, Exod. ix.

And, which was not his least cross, like Adam, with an ill-counselling wife.

Job hath three with him, when he is changed by affliction;—so Christ hath three with him, when he is changed in transfiguration: which three, as they were by Christ, when Moses and Elias, law and prophecy, told him, in the mount, “of his departing, which he should accomplish at Jerusalem^y”;—so these three were with him, when he began to accomplish these things^z.

CHAP. LV.

Egyptians' Deities, ex Athenæ. Deipn. lib. 7.

[Schweigh. vol. 3. p. 94.]

ANAXANDRIDES, in his book of Cities, turning his speech to the Egyptians, saith thus:

Οὐκ ἂν δυνάμην συμμαχεῖν ὑμῖν ἐγώ.
 Οὐθ' οἱ τρόποι γὰρ ὁμοιοῦσ', οὐθ' οἱ νόμοι
 Ἡμῶν, ἀπ' ἀλλήλων δὲ διέχουσιν πολὺ.
 Βοῦν προσκυνεῖς· ἐγὼ δὲ θύω τοῖς θεοῖς.
 Τὴν ἔγχελυν μέγιστον ἡγεῖ δαίμονα.
 Ἡμεῖς δὲ τῶν ὄψων μέγιστον παραπολύ.
 Οὐκ ἐσθίεις ὕεια· ἐγὼ δὲ γ' ἥδομαι
 Μάλιστα τούτοις· Κύνι σέβεις, τύπτω δ' ἐγὼ,
 Τοῦψον κατεσθίουσαν ἡνίκ' ἂν λάβω.
 Τοὺς ἱερέας ἐνθάδε μὲν ὀλοκλήρους νόμος
 εἶναι· παρ' ὑμῖν δ, ὡς εἰσὶν, ἀπηργμένους.
 Τὸν αἰέλουρον ἐὰν κακῶς ἔχοντ' ἴδῃς
 Κλαίεις· ἐγὼ δ' ἥδιστ' ἀποκτείνας δέξω.
 Δύναται παρ' ὑμῖν μυγαλὴ, παρ' ἐμοὶ δὲ γ' οὐ.

Thus does one heathen idolater deride another, because he worships (as the other thinks) the more ridiculous deities. The very heathen could deride and scoff at their vain gods. Dionysius was most notorious this way: and knavish, in this kind, was the painter, who, when he should have drawn the picture of such a goddess for a Grecian city to worship, he drew the portraiture of his own sweetheart, and so made her to be adored. And, indeed, what man could have held laugh-

^x Judg. xvi.

^y Luke, ix. 31.

^z Matt. xxvi. 37.

ing, to have seen (as my poet saith here) an Egyptian on his marrowbones adoring a dog, or praying to an ox,—or, especially, to see him mourning and howling over a sick cat; fearing lest his scratching god should die.

CHAP. LVI.

Of the Law broken by Adam.

THE law was Adam's lease, when God made him tenant of Eden: the conditions of which bond when he kept not, he forfeited himself and all us. God read a lecture of the law to him before he fell, to be a hedge^a to him to keep him in Paradise; but, when Adam would not keep within compass, this law is now become as the flaming sword at Eden gate, to keep him and his posterity out. Adam heard as much in the garden, as Israel did at Sinai; but only in fewer words, and without thunder. The law came more gently to him before his fall; but, after his fall, comes the thunder with it.

Adam, at one clap, breaks both the tables, and all the commandments:—

1. He chose him another god, when he followed the devil.
2. He idolized and deified his own belly; as the apostle's phrase is, "His belly he made his god."
3. He took the name of God in vain, when he believed him not.
4. He kept not the rest and estate, wherein God had set him.
5. He dishonoured his father, which was in heaven; therefore, his days were not long in that land, which the Lord his God had given him.
6. He massacred himself and all his posterity.
7. From Eve he was virgin; but, in eyes and mind, he committed spiritual fornication.
8. He, like Achan, stole that which God had set aside, not to be meddled with; and this his stealth is that, which troubles all Israel, the whole world.
9. He bare witness against God, when he believed the witness of the devil above him.
10. He coveted an ill covetousness, like Amnon; which cost him his life and all his progeny.

^a The Jews, in their writings, use this phrase frequently for the Law, as in Pirke Aboth.

What a nest of evils here were committed, at one blow : the pride of heart and desire of more knowledge, like Haman's ambition, overthrew us. This sin was hatched in heaven by the wicked angels, but thrown out with them, and never will come in there again. Hence is this sin so lofty, because it affects its first nest. It is not for nothing, that "Blessed are the poor in spirit," are the first words in Christ's sermon^b ; but because, the proud in spirit were the first sinners.

CHAP. LVII.

Of the Law given at Sinai.

WHEN Israel is got from the hard service of Egypt, God binds them apprentice to a new master,—himself. Their indentures he draws up on mount Sinai : a place, where Moses before had kept a flock of sheep ; now he keeps a troop of men. In the delivery of the law there,—if you will stand with Israel in your place, you may consider many passages.

CHAP. LVIII.

Why the Law was published then, and not before.

AT Sinai, was delivered no new thing : the law, in some kind, was known before. Sacrifice was used by Adam in the garden, when the body of the beasts went for an offering for his soul, and the skins for a covering for his body : Cain and Abel learn this part of worship from their father. The division of clean and unclean beasts is known to Noah, when they come to him for their lives, as they had done to Adam for their names. Abraham, when God made a covenant^c with him^d, divides and divides not his beasts and fowls, just as God commands^e ; and so of the rest. Fathers could teach their children these things, as they themselves had learned them of their fathers. But, when men began to multiply, and multitude to be more wicked, then would they not be so easily bridled by a law, whose Author they knew no more of, but their fathers : and when men lived but a short time in

^b Matt. v. 3.

^c So says the Geneva Bible, in margin : but Rab. Solomon, long before, saith thus : 'It is the custom of those that make covenants, to divide beasts into two parts, and pass between the parts : as, Jer. xxiv. 18. And God passes between these, in this smoking furnace and fire-brand, for making covenants in like kinds.'—Homer speaks near this.

^d Gen. xv.

^e Lev. i. 6. 17.

comparison of the first men, and so could not see the full settling of the law in their houses: and when God had fetched him a people out of Egypt, and laid the foundation of a glorious church, with signs and wonders,—then he thought it fit for their restriction, as also^f for their distinction from the heathen, to give the law from his own mouth, the more to procure reverence to him: for “Heaven and earth must needs hearken, when the Lord speaketh^g.” And thus did the heathen^h feign they received their laws from a deity, that was never seen; and yet their laws were the better observed for that reason.

CHAP. LIX.

Of the Place where it was given, and Manner.

GOD gave the law in Arabia: so wicked Mahomet gave his law in Arabia; a worse, and a better thing, no one country ever afforded. God gave his law in Sinai, a bushy place, as it seems by the nameⁱ, agreeable to the giving of so perplexing a matter. Carry along with thee, gentle reader, as thou readest the Scripture, thus much care (at my request) as to mark, that the law of Moses was given in two places,—Sinai, and the tabernacle; as also to consider, that some part of this law did only concern the Jews, and some part did also concern all the world. The ceremonial law, that concerned only the Jews, was given to Moses in private, in the tabernacle^j; and fell with the tabernacle, when the veil rent in twain. The moral law concerns the whole world; and it was given in sight of the whole world, on the top of a mountain; and must endure as long, as any mountain standeth. The judicial law (which is more indifferent, and may stand or fall, as seems best for the good of a commonwealth) was given, neither so public as the one, nor so private as the other; but in a mean between both.

The law on Sinai, was with fire and trumpets: so shall Christ come, with fire and trumpet, at the latter day, to take an account how men have kept this fiery law, as it is called, Deut. xxxiii. 2. ‘Fiery,’ “because given out of the fire,” as the Jerusalem and Babylonian Targums hold: though I think there is more meant by the words than so; for it is ‘Esh dath,’ which may be rendered ‘the fire of a law.’

^f Vid. Jarchi on Ruth, cap. i.

^g Isa. i. 2.

^h Numa, Minos, &c.

ⁱ Seneh signifieth ‘a bush,’ Exod. iii.

^j Lev. i.

Of the Effects of the Law.

THE letter of the law is death: but the Spirit giveth life. The Jews stand upon the letter, and think to gain life by the works of it; but them the apostle frequently confuteth. And I take the aimⁱ of Christ's parable^j, about the penny, to extend to no less. Some came into the vineyard, at the dawning of the day, or the age before the flood; and some at the third hour, or in the time before the law; and some at the sixth and ninth hour, or under the heat and burden of the Jewish law; and some at the last, under the gospel. Those, under the law, plead for merit; 'We have borne the heat and burden of the day;' that is, costly sacrifices, sore ceremonies, &c. To whom the master answers, That his penny is his own; and if he give it, it is not for their merit, but his good will. St. Paul calls the law 'a schoolmaster;' and so it is indeed: and such a schoolmaster, as that that Livy and Florus speak of in Italy, who brought forth his children, that were trusted with him, to Hannibal; who if he had not been more merciful than otherwise, they had all perished. So they, that rely upon the works of the law, are, in fine, constrained by the law, to come to Christ; who, more merciful than the law, does deliver them. And, if you well weigh it, you shall find, that as the whole law, so every part, from one to another, brings us to Christ. The moral law shows us what we should do; and, with the same sight, we find that we cannot do it. This makes us to seek to the ceremonial, for some sacrifice, or ceremony, to answer for our not doing it. There we see, that burning a dead beast, is but poor satisfaction for the sins of men living,—and that outward purifyings of men's selves, can avail but little to the cleansing of a soiled soul: this, then, delivers us to the judicial law; and by it, we see what we deserve; and thus, in fine, we are constrained to seek to Christ Jesus^k; "for there is no other name, whereby we must be saved." The parable, that our Saviour propounds in the tenth of Luke, I think, tends something to this purpose. "A man (saith he) went from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among thieves; and they robbed him of his raiment, and wounded him, and departed, leaving him half dead. A certain priest came that way; and, when he saw him, he turned

ⁱ Vid. Hilar. et Hieron. in loc. ^j Matt. xx. ^k It was Jesus, or Joshua, and not Moses, or the law, that brought Israel into the land of Canaan.

aside. A Levite came that way: and, when he saw him, he passed by on the other side. But a good Samaritan came (as the text imports), and pitied him, and salved him, and lodged him, and paid for him." Such a one is man fallen among Satan, sin, and death, and by them stopped, stripped, and striped. Satan dismounts him off his innocency, that should sustain him: sin strips him of all righteousness, that should array him: death strikes him with guiltiness, and wounds him. Here is a man in a woful case, and none to aid him. By comes a priest,—that is, first come the sacrifices of the legal priesthood; and they may pass by him; but they do not, they cannot, help him. By comes a Levite,—that is, the ceremonies of the Levitical law; and they may pass by him; but they do not, they cannot, help him. Or, by comes a priest,—that is, the angels may see him thus; but they let him lie; for they cannot help him. By comes a Levite,—that is, men and the world may see him thus; but they let him alone for ever; for they cannot succour him. But, by comes a good Samaritan,—that is, our Saviour himself, who is called a Samaritan, and is said to have a devil,—and he pities him, salves him, lodges him, and pays for him. He pities him, in very bowels; therefore he says, "As I live, I would not the death of a sinner." He salves him, with his own blood; therefore, it is said, "By his stripes we are healed." He lodges him, in his own church; therefore, the church saith, 'He brought me into the wine-cellar, and love was his banner over me.' And he pays for him what he deserved; therefore, he saith, "I have trod the wine-press alone."

It is said, in the Book of Kings, that, when the Shunammite's dead child was to be raised, Elisha first sent his staff to be laid upon him, but that did no good: but when Elisha came himself, and lay upon him, with his mouth to the child's mouth, his eyes to his eyes, and his hands to his hands,—then the child recovered. So, when man was "dead in trespasses and sin¹," God lays his staff^m or rod of the law upon him: but what good did this^e towards his recovery? Even make him to long the more for Elisha, or Christ; who, when he came, and laid his mouth to man's mouth, and kissed humanity in his incarnation, and laid his eyes to his eyes, and his hands to his hands, and suffered for man's actions at his passion,—then is man recured. God, in the Book of Isaiahⁿ, when he is to

¹ Eph. ii.^m Psal. xxiii.ⁿ Isa. vi. 8.

send a prophet to Israel, says thus, 'Mi eslah:': "Whom shall I send, or who will go for us?" Upon which words, the Jew Kimchi paraphrases thus: "Shalahti eth Micah, wehem maccim otho; Shalahti eth Amos, wehem korim otho Pesilusa°;" "I have sent Micah, and him they smote; I have sent Amos, and him they called a stammerer. Whom shall I send, or who will go for us?" Then says Isaiah, "Behold, I am here; send me." Imagine that, upon the fall of man, you saw God about to send the great Prophet, not to Israel alone, but to all the world,—nor only to teach, but also to redeem. Suppose you heard him thus questioning,—"Whom shall I send to restore fallen man? And who will go for us? Should I send angels? They are creatures, and, consequently, finite; and so, cannot answer mine infinite justice. Should I send man himself? Alas! though he once had power not to have fallen, yet, now hath he no power to raise himself again. Should I send beasts to sacrifice themselves for him? Alas! can the burning of dead beasts, satisfy for the sins of all men alive? Whom shall I send, or who will go for us?" Our Saviour is ready to answer, with Isaiah; "'Behold, I am here; send me.' Here am I, that am able to do it; send me, for I am willing. I am able; for I am God: I am willing, for I will become a man: I am God; and so can fulfil the law, which man hath broke. I will become man, that so I may suffer death, which man hath deserved. Behold, I am here; send me."—Then, as one of our country martyrs, at his death, so may we sing all our lives; "None but Christ, none but Christ:" none but Christ, to cure the wounded traveller; none but Christ, to raise the dead Shunammite; none but Christ, to restore decayed mankind; none but Christ, that would; none but Christ, that could. No angel, no man, no creature, no sacrifice, no ceremony, that would and could do this for us, which we could not do for ourselves, and say for us, "I have trod the wine-press alone."

When the ceremonial and judicial law have thus brought us to Christ, we may shake hands with them and farewell; but for the moral, as it helps to bring us thither, so must it help to keep us there: for Christ came not to disannul this law, but to fulfil it. He does not acquit us from this, but furthers us to the keeping of it. What else is the gospel, but this, in milder terms of faith and repentance? which is,

° Amos, in Heb. signifies, one that is heavy-tongued, which Kimchi calls 'Peselusa,' from the Greek ψαλλός, blæsus.

since we cannot keep this law, yet to strive to keep it as we can, and to repent us for that we have not kept it, and to rely upon his merits that hath kept it for us. Thus, as love to God, and to our neighbours, was the sum of the Old,—so true faith, and unfeigned repentance, is the total of the New. This was the tenor of Christ's first words after his baptism^p, and of his last words before his ascension^q.

CHAP. LXI.

Of the Ten Commandments.

THE ten commandments may be called 'the word of the word of God:' for, though all Scripture be his word, yet these, in more special, be his Scripture, to which he made himself his own scribe or penman: upon these commandments, hang all the law and the prophets; and these commandments upon two duties,—to love God, and to love our neighbour. A shorter, and yet a fuller comment, needs not to be given of them, than what our Saviour hath given^r; "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind: and thy neighbour as thyself."—The four commandments of the first table, he expounds in four words.

"The Lord thy God;" there is the preface: "I am the Lord," &c.

Thou shalt love the Lord, &c. with all thy

Heart	}	for the	}	First	}	Commandment.
Soul				Second		
Strength				Third		
Mind				Fourth		

If we need any farther exposition upon this exposition of our Saviour's, it is easy to find: as, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine

Heart	}	for it he hath	}	Created.
Soul				Redeemed.
Strength				Preserved.
Mind				Enlightened.

And, therefore, thou shalt love him with all thine

Heart	}	without	}	Only talking, and no more.
Soul				Dissembling.
Strength				Revolting.
Mind				Erring.

^p Mark, i. 15.

^q Mark, xvi. 16.

^r Luke, x. 27.

“ This is the first and the great commandment ; and the other is like unto this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.” This adds great light to the second table ; for half of the commandments of that table want an object, whereupon to fasten the duty. The first hath one, “ Honour thy father,” &c ; the last but one hath one, “ Thou shalt not witness falsely against thy neighbour : ” and so the last hath, “ Thou shalt not covet aught of thy neighbour’s.” But, “ Thou shalt not kill, steal, and commit adultery,”—these have no object,—viz. none named, whom, from whom, and with whom, we must not kill, steal, nor adulterate : because we must make ourselves also the object here : and reflect the commandments upon ourselves,—as thus : ‘ Thou shalt not kill ;’ first, not thyself,—and, secondly, not thy neighbour ; and so of the rest. The Jews have been too bold in adding too strict an object, as you may see in their explaining these three precepts. And some heretics have been too nice, in giving some of them too large^s a one.

The fifth commandment, in the ten, is with a promise ; and the fifth petition, in the Lord’s prayer, is with a condition.

I omit the exquisiteness of the pricking of this piece of Scripture of the commandments extraordinarily : some special thing is in it.

The Jews do gather six hundred and thirteen precepts, negative and affirmative, to be in the whole law, according to the six hundred and thirteen letters in the two tables, and so many veins and members in a man’s body. The order of these precepts they have set down in the margin of the Pentateuch, with the threefold Targum printed at Han-now, and in Sepher Hahhinnuch. I had translated some hundreds of them into English, which I thought to have finished, and presented to the view of the reader ; but I find, that, without the Jews’ comments upon these their divisions, they can hardly be understood : which to bring withal, is a pains of no small time and labour.—These my observations and collections in my reading, accept, gentle reader ; and the slips pass over with a gentle eye, as slips of youth ; which more mature years may recure, if God prosper and second : to whom I commit myself, and commend thee ; and to whom be all honour and glory for evermore. Amen.

^s For Marcion held it unlawful to kill a beast : because the command ‘ non occides,’ hath no set object. Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. 1. cap. 20.

INDEX

TO

THE ERUBHIN.

PAGE

Chap. i.	Of knowledge of God	7
Chap. ii.	Of the names of God, used by Jews and Gentiles .	8
Chap. iii.	Of the phrase, 'The sons of God,' Gen. vi, and Job i.	12
Chap. iv.	Of the phrase, 'Son of man'	13
Chap. v.	Of Japheth's plantation by his son Javan	ib.
Chap. vi.	Of Jewish learning	14
Chap. vii.	Of the Talmud	15
Chap. viii.	Talmudism	16
Chap. ix.	Of the Cabalists	18
Chap. x.	Gideon's army. Josh. vii.	ib.
Chap. xi.	A Jerusalem tenet, ex Kimchio in Præfat. to the Small Prophets	19
Chap. xii.	Nun inversum. Num. x and xi.	ib.
Chap. xiii.	Of the Masorites	20
Chap. xiv.	Of the marginal readings	ib.
Chap. xv.	Ex Kimchio in Jonah	21
Chap. xvi.	Of sacrifice	23
Chap. xvii.	A just judgment	26
Chap. xviii.	Of the name of the Red Sea	27
Chap. xix.	Of the word 'Raca.' Matt. v. 22	ib.
Chap. xx.	Wit stolen by Jews out of the gospel	28
Chap. xxi.	St. Cyprian's nicety about the last petition in the Lord's prayer	29
Chap. xxii.	Septuaginta interpreters	30
Chap. xxiii.	The Septuagint over authorized by some	32
Chap. xxiv.	Phrases taken from Jews in the New Testament .	33
Chap. xxv.	Nineveh's conversion. Jonah iii.	34
Chap. xxvi.	Of the Jews' sacraments, circumcision and Pass- over	36
Chap. xxvii.	Of the Passover	38
Chap. xxviii.	Of the confusion of tongues	40

	PAGE
Chap. xxix. Of letters	44
Chap. xxx. Of the Hebrew tongue	46
Chap. xxxi. Of vowels	49
Chap. xxxii. Of the language of the two Testaments	50
Chap. xxxiii. Of the New Testament language ; or, the Greek	52
Chap. xxxiv. Of the Chaldee and Syrian tongues	54
Chap. xxxv. Of the Arabian language	55
Chap. xxxvi. Of the Latin tongue	ib.
Chap. xxxvii. The language of Britain near a thousand years ago	56
Chap. xxxviii. Jonathan, the Chaldee paraphrast's conceit of Levi's choosing to the priesthood ; translated out of his Paraph. on Gen. xxxii. 24	ib.
Chap. xxxix. Of the Jews' abbreviature, "עץ"	57
Chap. xl. 'Mazkir neshamoth ;' or, 'the remembrancer of souls :' in the Jews' liturgy	ib.
Chap. xli. Of the Latin translation of Matt. vi. 1	59
Chap. xlii. An emblem	60
Chap. xliii. Mahanaim. Gen. xxxii. 2	ib.
Chap. xliv. The Book of Psalms	61
Chap. xlv. Of the creation	62
Chap. xlvi. The time and manner of the creation	63
Chap. xlvii. Of the fall of Adam	66
Chap. xlviii. Ophitæ ; Evia	68
Chap. xlix. Of the Greek translation of the fifth of Genesis	ib.
Chap. l. Upon the words, 'The seed of the woman shall break the serpent's head'	69
Chap. li. Jewish hypocritical prayers, reprov'd by our Saviour, Matt. vi. 5 ; "Because they love to stand praying in the synagogues, and corners of the streets"	70
Chap. lii. Israel's affliction in Egypt	71
Chap. liii. Israel's camp : according to the Chaldee paraphrast's description. Num. ii.	72
Chap. liv. Of Job	75
Chap. lv. Egyptians' deities	76
Chap. lvi. Of the law, broken by Adam	77
Chap. lvii. Of the law given at Sinai	78
Chap. lviii. Why the law was published then, and not before	ib.
Chap. lix. Of the place where it was given, and manner	79
Chap. lx. Of the effects of the law	80
Chap. lxi. Of the ten commandments	83

THE
HARMONY
OF
THE FOUR EVANGELISTS,

AMONG THEMSELVES, AND WITH THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The First Part.

FROM
THE BEGINNING OF THE GOSPELS TO THE BAPTISM OF
OUR SAVIOUR:

WITH
AN EXPLANATION
OF THE
CHIEFEST DIFFICULTIES BOTH IN LANGUAGE AND SENSE.

***TO THE
MOST RENOWNED AND ILLUSTRIOUS KNIGHT,
AND
CHAMPION OF THE GOSPEL,
HIS EXCELLENCY,
ROBERT, EARL OF ESSEX,
&c. &c.**

LORD GENERAL OF ALL THE FORCES RAISED BY
THE HONOURABLE HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT, FOR THE DEFENCE OF
LAWS, LIBERTIES, AND RELIGION.

SIR,

THIS whole undertaking was vowed to your great name, and this piece of it, in writing, presented to your noble hands, before the Lord and the state had placed you in that high station, in which you now stand. And, as I cannot but applaud the happy prognostic of mine own thoughts, which found out such a patron for ‘The Harmony of the Evangelists,’ as the high court of heaven and of England have since called out to be the patron of the gospel itself; so can I not but bewail the unhappy condition of mine own disabilities; which can neither present any thing better, than what I now publish, to so great a person; nor yet could publish any whit sooner, that which I then presented, though it had been better. Your Excellency’s candour will help to excuse both the one failing and the other [give me leave to presage it]; since I know such nobleness as yours, accepteth according to what a man hath, and

* Omitted by Dr. Bright.

expecteth not according to what he hath not. Mine address, in this kind, unto yourself, I shall not go about to excuse, but must rather justify; and though it be exceeding bold,—yet, to me, it seems exceeding reasonable. For to whom should a Staffordshire student devote his studies, but to the glory of Staffordshire? and whither should a treatise upon the Gospels refuge for patronage, but to the great patron of the gospel? I know mine own insufficiency for such a work, and am conscious to myself of my many failings in the managing of it; yet could I not but undertake it, in hope of some profit to the reader; nor could I but address it to such a patron, in hope of some entertainment with your Excellency.

The ‘Harmony of the Evangelists,’ in our English tongue, is rare to find; especially, with that proof of the order of the story, and that illustration of the text and language, that a thing of that nature doth require, and that it hath found in other tongues. Mine own heart did tell me, that I, of all others, was most unfit and unable for such an undertaking, in regard of want of parts, means, and opportunity; yet could I not desist from such an attempt, but must needs try what I could do in this kind; partly, that I might bring something towards the building of the tabernacle, though it were never so small,—and chiefly, that I might stir up some pen of a greater ability, to set to a work of so brave import.

An essay and trial of some of my progress in such an undertaking, I do here most humbly lay at your Excellency’s feet; and that, not only as an oblation tendered to your Nobleness this once, but also as an earnest of a future tribute of this kind, till the whole

work be finished, and the 'Harmony' completed, if God vouchsafe health, strength, and opportunity,—and your Excellency, acceptance, countenance, and encouragement. There is nothing in the workman, or the workmanship, that can ground any hope for any such thing, from you; but there is enough in your own known worth, goodness, and noble disposition, to make me confident, that you will not only not reject the work, but that you will also accept the workman for the work's sake, because the subject of it is the Evangelists. It is now become your honourable profession to be 'the champion of the gospel;' and the Lord hath installed you in an order, of which, to a Constantine, a Sweden, and an Essex, I know not what histories can add a fourth, that hath been 'the Evangelical Knight,' or 'the Knight of the Gospel.' How you have honoured this your order, by your great achievements; and how the great trust reposed in you, hath met with as great trustiness,—it is the happiness of the nation to have tried, and to remember; and it cannot but be the rejoicing and comfort of your poor suppliant to think of, and to consider. For, to have to deal with so constant worthiness, nobleness, and candour; with so great piety, zeal, religiousness, and honour; with so much accomplishment, excellency, and splendour,—cannot but promise a comfortable access, a cheerful entertainment, and a desired issue. I have no more to say [for short speech best agreeth with your great employments] but only this;—to beg of your Excellency, that, among the serious cares and thoughts of your noble heart, you would remember our poor wronged Staffordshire, for good; and labour her

delivery, not only from her open enemies, but also from her seeming friends, which do worse devour her.

And to the throne of grace, it must be my continual suit and petition, that the Lord would crown all your great engagements with happy success; make you still a blessing and rejoicing to the English nation; preserve your person; increase your honour; support your heart; direct your steps; immortalize your name here, and lade your Excellency with the most excellent weight of glory hereafter. So ever prayeth, and so ever must pray,

Your Excellency's most humble, and most

devoted servant, and poor countryman,

JOHN LIGHTFOOT.

From my study in Little Britain,

Sept. 30, 1644.

THE

EPISTLE TO THE READER.

GENTLE READER,

THE veil of the sanctuary was supported by four pillars, and wrought with great variety of works and colours : so is the story of the veil of Christ's flesh, by the four evangelists, and the texture of it, of like variety. For one relateth what another hath omitted ; one more largely, what another more brief ; one more plain, what another less ; one before, what another after ; one after one manner, and another after another. And so they bring their several pieces of embroidery, differing in colours, but not in substance,—various in workmanship, but not in the groundwork,—to constitute and make up a perfect and sacred tapestry and furniture in the house of the Lord ; and carrying several faces in the manner of their writing and composal, like those living creatures in Ezekiel and the Revelation ; yet, they sweetly and harmoniously meet together, in the one body and compacture of a perfect story.

To sew these parcels together into one piece, and so to dispose and place them in their proper order, as the continuance and chronicle method of the history doth require, is, “ *hic labor, hoc opus*,” a thing of no small pains and difficulty,—and yet, a thing, that, with pains and industry, may be brought to pass. For, in many passages and dislocations, the text hath showed the proper place of such dislocated parcels, and the proper way and manner to join them, where they should be joined, so plainly ; and, in all places, it hath hinted this so surely, though sometimes more obscurely, that serious study, and mature deliberation, may certainly fix and settle them. Divers great and learned pens have laboured in this work, both ancient and modern, both Romish and protestant ; but hardly any, if any at all, in our own mother-tongue, so fully and largely, as a work of this nature doth require. This hath incited me,—though the unfittest

of all others, for a task of so much learning, judgment, and seriousness,—to attempt this work ; and, if possibly my dimness might,—to give some light and facility to the history of the gospel, and, if my poorness could,—some contribution towards the building of Sion.

The method, that I prescribed to myself in this undertaking (some glimpse whereof thou mayst see in this present parcel), was, 1. To lay the text of the evangelists in that order, which the nature and progress of the story doth necessarily require. 2. To give a reason of this order, why the text is so laid, more largely or more briefly, according as the plainness, or difficulty, of the connexion, doth call for it. 3. To give some account of the difficulties in the language of the original, as any came to hand, either being naturally so in the Greek itself ;—or being made difficulties when they were not so, by the curiosity, misconstruction, or self-end-seeking of some expositors. 4. And lastly, To clear and open the sense and meaning of the text all along as it went,—especially, where it was of more abstruseness and obscurity.

These two last things did I essay, and go on withal a great way in the work, with much largeness and copiousness, both concerning the language, and the manner. For, for the first, I did not only poise the Greek in the balance of its own country, and of the Septuagint ; but I also examined translations in divers languages,—produced their sense,—and showed cause of adhering to, or refusing of, their sense, as I conceived cause.

And, for the second,—I alleged the various expositions and interpretations of commentators, both ancient and modern, and others that spake to such and such places occasionally ; I examined their expositions, and gave the reader reason to refuse or embrace them, as cause required. When seeing the work, in this way, likely to rise to vastness of bulk itself, and of trouble to the reader, I chose to abridge this first part, for a trial ; and therein, having expressed only those things, which were most material for the understanding of the text, where it is less plain, (for where it is plain enough, why should I spend time and labour about it?) and spoken mine own thoughts upon it, and omitted (unless it be for a taste of what I had done) the glosses and thoughts of others ;—I now wait for the direction and advice of my

learned and loving friends and readers, whether to exhibit the other parts, that are to follow (by God's good blessing and assistance), in that large and voluminous method, that, at the first, I prescribed to myself; or in that succiseness, that this present parcel holdeth out.

I have partly chosen, and have partly been constrained, to tender this work to public view by pieces; whereof only this, and this but a small one neither, appears at this time. I have chosen so to do, that I might give the world my thoughts upon the evangelists, as the Lord giveth time: for who would defer to do any thing of such a work, till he have done all, since our lives are so short and uncertain, and the work so long and difficult? And I have been constrained thus to do,—partly, because of mine other occasions, many and urgent, which deny me opportunity to follow that business, as such a bulk would require; and partly, because of the straits of the times, which have straitened our presses, that they print but rarely any thing voluminous. Every year, by God's permission and good assistance, shall yield its piece, till all be finished,—if the Lord spare life, health, and liberty, thereunto.

Divers things were fitting to have been premised to a work of this nature; but, because that if they should all be set before this small piece, that we now exhibit, the preface, or prolegomena, would be larger than the book itself;—therefore, have I reserved to every piece, that shall come forth, its own share and portion. And the things that I have thought upon, and hewed out, unto this purpose, are these:—

1. To fix the certain year of our Saviour's birth, as a thing very fit to be looked after; and to show the certain grounds whereupon to go, that our fixing upon such a year may be warranted, and without wavering. This have I premised to this first part, wherein comes the story and treatise of our Saviour's birth.

2. To give account of all the dislocations of texts and stories in the Old Testament, which are exceeding many; to show, where is their proper place and order; and to give the reason of their dislocation: and this being so copious and frequent in the Old Testament, the like will be thought the less strange and uncouth in the New.

3. To make a chorographical description of the land of

Canaan, and those adjoining places that we have occasion to look upon, as we read the Gospel; a thing of no small necessity, for the clearer understanding of the story.

4. To make a topographical description of Jerusalem, and of the fabric of the temple, which will facilitate divers passages in the Gospel, which are of no small obscurity.

5. To give some account and story of the state and customs of the Jews in these times, when the gospel began, and was first preached among them, out of their own, and other writers; which things, the evangelists mention not; and yet which conduce, not a little, to the understanding of the evangelists.

These, as things very necessary for the matter in hand, shall wait severally upon the several parts that shall follow; as the Lord shall please to vouchsafe ability, time, health, and safety.

From my chamber in Westminster,

Oct. 1, 1644.

PROLEGOMENA.

THE AGE OF THE WORLD AT OUR SAVIOUR'S BIRTH FIXED:
THE ACCOUNT PROVED: THE CHIEFEST DIFFICULTIES IN
THE SCRIPTURE CHRONICLE RESOLVED.

IN the stories of times, the times of the stories do challenge special notice and observation; and, of all other, that of our Saviour's birth, being 'the fulness of time,' may best, as best worthy, make such a challenge. A time, to which all the holy ones that went before it, did bend their eyes and expectation; and a time, from which all the Christians that have lived since, have dated their chronical accounts and computation. And yet, how unfixed is this time and age of the world, in which so great a mystery came to pass, and upon which so general accounting doth depend, in the various reckonings of learned and industrious men! It is not only to be seen in their writings; wondered at, in regard of the great difference at which they count; but the fixed time is the more to be studied for, upon this very reason,—because such men do so greatly differ among themselves. The only way to settle, in such variety, is, to take the plain and clear account and reckoning of the Scripture, which hath taken a peculiar care to give an exact and most certain chronicle to this time,—and not to rely upon the computation of Olympiads, consuls, or any other human calculation; which, it cannot be doubted, must, of necessity, leave the deepest student of them in doubting and uncertainty. Now the Scripture, carrying on a most faithful reckoning of the times, from the beginning of time to this fulness of it, hath laid this great, wondrous, and happy occurrence, of the birth of the Redeemer, in the year of the world, 3928. Which that we may make good and fixed among so much variety and difference, may the reader gently have the patience to see and to examine the particular

sums, by which the Scripture accounteth to make up this total, and to study upon those scruples in the several parcels, where they come, that make the account intricate and doubtful,—and to judge upon those resolutions and satisfactions, that shall be tendered for the clearing and untying of those scruples.

And, surely, though the business may be something long and difficult, which we shall propose and lay before him,—yet doubt I not, but the profit will fully countervail his labour, when he shall not only be resolved of the certainty of the time, which we now have occasion, and every Christian hath cause, to look after,—but when he shall also see (and that, I suppose, not without admiration) the wondrous and mysterious, and yet, always, instructive style and manner of accounting, used by the Holy Ghost, in most sacred majestickness, and challenging all serious study and reverence. And though, also, this business may seem to be something too Parergon and eccentric to the main work that we have before us, the harmonizing of the evangelists,—yet, since a prime thing, that we are to inquire after, in the very entrance of this story of our Saviour's life, is, the fixed and certain time of his birth,—the reader will be pleased to excuse a fault on the right hand, rather than on the left; and to dispense with too much desire to give satisfaction, rather than too little, or with none at all.

SECTION I.

From the Creation to the Flood were 1656 Years, as appeareth Gen. v, vi, and vii, by these Parcels:—

ADAM, at	130 years old, hath Seth; ver. 3.
Seth, at	105 years old, hath Enos; ver. 6.
Enos, at	90 years old, hath Cainan; ver. 9.
Cainan, at	70 years old, hath Mahalaleel; ver. 12.
Mahalaleel, at	65 years old, hath Jared; ver. 15.
Jared, at	162 years old, hath Enoch; ver. 18.
Enoch, at	65 years old, hath Methuselah; ver. 21.
Methuselah, at	187 years old, hath Lamech; ver. 25.
Lamech, at	182 years old, hath Noah; ver. 28, 29.
Noah, at	600 years old, seeth the flood; Gen. vii. 11.

Total, 1656; which whole year of the world, was taken up with the flood; viz. from the seventeenth day of

the second month, or Marchesvan [Gen. vii. 11], to the twenty-seventh day of the same month come twelvemonth [Gen. viii. 14].

SECTION II.

From the Flood to Terah's Death, and the Promise then given to Abram, were 427 Years, as appeareth Gen. xi, by these Particulars:—

SHEM, at 2 years after the flood, begat Arphaxad ;
ver. 10.

Arphaxad, at 35 years old, begat Salah ; ver. 12.

Salah, at 30 years old, begat Eber ; ver. 14.

Eber, at 34 years old, begat Peleg ; ver. 16.

Peleg, at 30 years old, begat Reu ; ver. 18.

Reu, at 32 years old, begat Serug ; ver. 20.

Serug, at 30 years old, begat Nahor ; ver. 22.

Nahor, at 29 years old, begat Terah ; ver. 24.

Terah, at 130 years old, begat Abram.

Abram, at 75 years old, hath the promise ; Gen. xii. 4.

Total, 427. Which sum being added to 1656, which was the age of the world at the flood, amounteth to 2083 ; and it resulteth, that the promise was given to Abram in the year of the world 2083.

But here is the great question moved,—Whether Abram were the eldest son of Terah, yea or no ? If he were, then was he born, when Terah was seventy years of age, Gen. xi. 26 ; and not, as this table layeth it, at his hundred and thirtieth. And if he were not his eldest son, why hath Moses named him first of all his sons ?

Answer. First, He was not his eldest son : for, 1. He married his brother Haran's daughter [for so all men hold Sarai to have been], and she was but ten years younger than himself, Gen. xvii. 17 ; which was impossible, if her father were younger than he. 2. He is said to be but seventy-five years old, when he departed out of Haran, Gen. xii. 4 : and this was after his father's death^a. Now, had he been born at Terah's seventieth, he had been 135 years old, when his father died. We must, therefore, compute and reckon backward, thus ;—that since he was but 75 years old, when his father died, it must needs be concluded, that he was born, when Terah was 130 ; as is laid down in the table.

^a Acts, vii. 4.

Answer. Secondly; He is reckoned first of Terah's sons as Shem is of Noah's; not because he was the first in time, but the first in dignity. For that Shem was not the eldest son of Noah, is clear, by comparing these places:—Gen. v. 32; Noah was 500 years old, when he begat his first son; and, Gen. vii. 11, when Noah was 600 years old, was the flood of waters upon the earth; and then was one of his sons 100 years old. But Shem was not so till two years after; Gen. xi. 10: and yet is he ever named the first of his sons,—Gen. v. 32; vi. 10; vii. 13; ix. 18; and x. 1.

There are some, that, not content with this plain, necessary, and undeniable, explication of the difficulty, do hold, that Abram took two journeys into Canaan,—one, before his father's death,—and another, after: whereas Moses and Stephen, well compared together, do plainly show the contrary;—and fully and sufficiently clear the matter under scruple. That which hath made men to fall into the mistake of his two journeys into Canaan, hath been this,—that they have taken the words of God, in Acts vii. 3, “Get thee out of thy country,” &c; and his words, in Gen. xii. 1, “Get thee out of thy country,” &c.—to be of the same time, and spoken in the same place: whereas there is a vast difference in the words themselves, and so was there of the time and place, where they were spoken. Stephen telleth, that, while Abraham was in Mesopotamia, or Chaldea, as ver. 4, before he dwelt in Charran, God appeared to him, and said unto him, “Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred;” but not a word of departing from his father's house; for he took his father and his whole household along with him, and dwelt with them a good while in Haran, Gen. xi. 3: “And Terah died in Haran,” ver. 32. “*Then* the Lord said unto Abram;” for so should Gen. xii. 1 be translated; and not, “*Now* the Lord *had* said:” and his saying was this, “Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house,” too; for that, also, he now left behind him,—namely, Nahor, and all his father's family, but only Lot and Sarai, that were fatherless children. And, this difference considered, as necessarily it must, it doth make this difficulty, which hath caused so much canvassing, so easy, as a thing needeth not to be more.

SECTION III.

From the Promise, given to Abram, upon his Father Terah's Death, to the Delivery of the People of Israel out of Egypt, and to the giving of the Law, were 430 Years ; Exod. xii. 40 ; Gal. iii. 17.

THIS sum being joined to that before, of 2083, it maketh the world to be in the two thousand five hundred and thirteenth year of her age, when Israel was delivered, and the law given.

This space of time, of 430 years, betwixt the promise and the law, the divine wisdom and providence cast into two equal portions,—of 215 years before the people's going down into Egypt, and 215 years of their being there.

The former moiety was taken up in these parcels :—

Five-and-twenty years, betwixt the giving of the promise, and the birth of Isaac : compare Gen. xii. 4, with Gen. xxi. 5.

Sixty years, betwixt the birth of Isaac, and the birth of Jacob ; Gen. xxv. 26.

A hundred and thirty years betwixt the birth of Jacob, and Israel's going into Egypt ; Gen. xxvii. 9.

The latter in these :—

Ninety-five years, from their going into Egypt, to the death of Levi.

Forty years, from the death of Levi, to the birth of Moses.

Eighty years, from the birth of Moses, to their delivery.

SECTION IV.

From the coming of Israel out of Egypt, to the laying of the Foundation of Solomon's Temple, were 480 Years ; 1 Kings vi. 1 : and 7 Years was it in building, ver. 38.

So that, join these 487, that passed from the coming out of Egypt, to the finishing of the temple, to the 2513 years, of which age the world was, when they came out of Egypt,—and it will appear, that Solomon's temple was finished exactly in the three thousandth year of the world.

This sum is made up of these many parcels :—

Israel in the wilderness, 40 years.

Joshua ruled 17 years.

Othniel judged 40 years, Judg. iii. 11.

Ehud judged	80 years, Judg. iii. 30.
Deborah judged	40 years, Judg. v. 31.
Gideon,	40 years, Judg. viii. 28.
Abimelech,	3 years, Judg. ix. 22.
Tolah,	23 years, Judg. x. 2.
Jair,	22 years, Judg. x. 3.
Jephthah,	6 years, Judg. xii. 7.
Ibzan,	7 years, Judg. xii. 9.
Elon,	10 years, Judg. xii. 11.
Abdon,	8 years, Judg. xii. 14.
Samson,	20 years, Judg. xv. 20; and xvi. 31.
Eli,	40 years, 1 Sam. iv. 18.
Samuel and Saul,	40 years, Acts xiii. 21.
David,	40 years, 1 Kings ii. 11.
Solomon,	4 years, 1 Kings vi. 1.
Total,	480 years.

Now, among all these parcels, there is no number that hath not a text to warrant it, but only the date of the government of Joshua,—which yet cannot be doubted of to have been seventeen years; seeing that so many years only are not specified by express text, of all the 480, mentioned 1 Kings vi. 1. And here, also, may the reader observe, that the years, that are mentioned in the Book of Judges, for years of Israel's oppression,—as, Judg. iii. 8. 14, &c.—are not to be taken for a space of time distinct from the time of the Judges, but included in the sum of their times.

Now, it thus falling out, as it is more than apparent, that Solomon's temple was finished and perfected in the year of the world 3000,—this, belike, hath helped to strengthen that opinion, that hath been taken up by some, that, 'as the world was six days in creating, so shall it be six thousand years in continuance; and then shall come the everlasting sabbath.' And, indeed, the observation could not but please those, that were pleased with this opinion; for, when they found, that the first three thousand years of the world did end in the perfecting of the earthly temple, it would make them to conclude the bolder, that the other three thousand should conclude in the consummation of the spiritual.

SECTION V.

From the finishing of Solomon's Temple, to the falling away of the ten Tribes, were 30 Years.

FOR Solomon reigned 40 years^b; and in the eleventh year of his reign, was the temple finished^c; and so, count from that year to the expiration of his reign, and the beginning of his son, Rehoboam,—and it will appear easily, that the falling away of the ten tribes was 30 years after the temple was finished, and in the year of the world, 3030.

SECTION VI.

From the falling away of the ten Tribes, under Jeroboam, to the Captivity of Judah into Babylon, were 390.

THESE are thus reckoned in a gross sum by Ezekiel^d; “I have laid upon thee the years of their iniquity, according to the number of days, three hundred and ninety days: so shalt thou bear the iniquity of the house of Israel. And when thou hast accomplished them, lie again on thy right side; and thou shalt bear the iniquity of the house of Judah forty days:—I have appointed thee each day for a year.”

Now, these are not to be taken for two different and distinct sums, as if it were 390 years from the falling away of the ten tribes, to the captiving of the ten tribes,—and 40 years from thence, to the captiving of Judah; for, it was but 200 years, and a little above a half, between the two first periods, and above 100 years between the two last:—but, the 40 years are to be reputed and counted within the 390, as the last years of them; and marked out so singularly, because of Judah's rebellion in, and under, so clear and powerful preaching of Jeremiah, who prophesied so long a time among them.

Now, for the casting of these 390 years into parcels, as the Books of Kings and Chronicles have done them, the surest and clearest way, is, to make a chronicle table of the collateral kingdoms of Judah and Israel, while they last together, from year to year, as they will offer themselves to parallel one another: in which course, some considerable scruples will arise before the student, as he goeth along,

^b 1 Kings, xi. 42.

^c 1 Kings, vi. 38.

^d Chap. iv. 5, 6.

which, unless he see and resolve, he will never be able to make the account right; and which, unless he frame to himself such a chronicle table as is mentioned, he will never see nor find out. He will, by the very table, as he goeth along, see, that sometimes the years are reckoned complete, as Rehoboam's seventeen are counted, 1 Kings xv. 1; sometimes current, as Abijam's three, 1 Kings xv. 1, 2. 9; and Elah's two, 1 Kings xvi. 8. But this will breed no difficulty; since it is ordinary, in Scripture, thus variously to compute; and since the drawing of his table will every where show him readily this variety.—But these things will he find of more obscurity, and challenging more serious study and consideration:—

1. It is said, that Jeroboam reigned two-and-twenty years, 1 Kings xiv. 20,—and Nadab, his son, two years, chap. xv. 25; yet, that Nadab began to reign in the second year of Asa, which was in the one-and-twentieth year of Jeroboam; and so Nadab's two years fall within the sum of his father's two-and-twenty.

Now, the reason of this accounting is this:—it is said, in 2 Chron. xiii. 20, that “the Lord struck Jeroboam, and he died:” that is, with some ill and languishing disease, that he could not administer nor rule the kingdom; therefore, was he forced to substitute his son, Nadab, in his lifetime; and, in one and the same year, both father and son died.

2. It is said, that Baasha began to reign in the third year of Asa, 1 Kings xv. 33, and reigned four-and-twenty years; then, it followeth, that he died in the six-and-twentieth year of Asa, as the text reckoneth the years current, 1 Kings xvi. 8: and yet, in the six-and-thirtieth year of Asa, Baasha came up and made war against Judah, 2 Chron. xvi. 1; so that this war will seem to be made by him nine or ten years after he is dead.

But the resolution of this, from the original, is easy; for that text in the Chronicles meaneth not, that Baasha made war against Judah in the six-and-thirtieth year of Asa's reign, but, in the six-and-thirtieth year of Asa's kingdom; that is, six-and-thirty years from the division of the tribes under Rehoboam: for Rehoboam reigned seventeen years,—Abijam, his son, three years,—and, in the sixteenth year of Asa, was this war made:—thirty-six years, in all, from the first division. The word מלכות, therefore,

should there be rendered 'the kingdom,' and not 'the reign,' and the thing were clear. Now, the text dateth this war, not from the time of Asa's reign, but from the time of the division of the tribes; because that, though they were divided hitherto in regard of their kings, yet not totally in regard of their converse and affection; for some of the revolted ones affected still the house of David:—but Baasha, to make the division sure, buildeth Ramah, that none might go in or out to Asa, king of Judah; and this was as a second division; and, therefore, the text reckoneth from the first.

3. It is said, 1 Kings xvi. 23, that "in the one-and-thirtieth year of Asa, king of Judah, began Omri to reign over Israel, twelve years; six years reigned he in Tirzah." And yet, in ver. 29, it is said, that "in the eight-and-thirtieth year of Asa, began Ahab, the son of Omri, to reign."

Now, how can there, possibly, be twelve years' reign betwixt Asa's thirty-first and thirty-eighth?

Answer: Omri began to reign, as soon as ever he had slain Zimri,—which was in the twenty-seventh of Asa: but he was not sole and entire king till his thirty-first: for Tibni, his competitor and corival for the crown, held him in agitation and wars till Asa's thirty-first. And then was he overcome, and Omri acknowledged absolute king, by Tibni's soldiers; and so, from thenceforward, he reigned sole king in Tirzah.

But yet the doubt remaineth, how Omri, beginning his monarchy in the thirty-first of Asa, and ending it in his thirty-eighth, can be said to have reigned but six years,—whereas it was eight current.

Answer: The six complete years only are reckoned: for the thirty-first of Asa was even ending, when Tibni was conquered, and the thirty-eighth but newly begun, when Omri died. Such another kind of reckoning may be observed in casting up the age of Abraham and Ishmael, at their circumcision, compared with the age of Abraham at Ishmael's death.

4. The beginning of the reign of Joram, the son of Jehoshaphat, hath three dates: the first, in the seventeenth year of Jehoshaphat, his father; compare 1 Kings, xxii. 51, 2 Kings, i. 17, and 2 Kings, iii. 1.

The second, in the fifth year of Joram, the son of Ahab; 2 Kings, viii. 16. This was in the two-and-twentieth year of his father, Jehoshaphat.

And the third, at his father Jehoshaphat's death; 2 Chron. xxi. 1.

Now the resolution of this ambiguity is thus. The first time he was made viceroy, when his father went out of the land for the recovery of Ramoth-gilead: and because Ahab, the king of Israel, went with him,—Ahaziah, his son, is made viceroy in that kingdom also.

The second time he was viceroy again, in his father Jehoshaphat's absence, upon his voyage into Moab with Jehoram [2 Kings iii]; and from this time doth the text date the fixed beginning of his reign, as is plain, 2 Kings viii. 17, 2 Chron. xxi. 20. For Jehoshaphat, after this time, was little at home, but abroad, either in his own land, perambulating it, to reduce the people to true religion,—or in Moab, to reduce that to subjection^f.

5. But a greater doubt meeteth you by far, when you come to cast up the times of his son Ahaziah. For whereas Joram was thirty-and-two years old, when he began to reign, and reigned eight years in Jerusalem [2 Kings viii. 17, 2 Chron. xxi. 20], and so died, when he was forty years old,—and instantly the inhabitants of Jerusalem set Ahaziah upon his throne, who was his youngest son,—yet was this Ahaziah forty-two years old, when he began to reign [2 Chron. xxii. 1], and so will prove to be two years older than his father.

Answer: The Book of Chronicles, in this place, meaneth not, that Ahaziah was so old when he began to reign; for the Book of Kings telleth plainly, that he was but two-and-twenty; 2 Kings viii. 26: but these two-and-forty years have relation to another thing,—namely, to the kingdom of the house of Omri, and not to the age of Ahaziah. For count from the beginning of the reign of Omri, and you find Ahaziah to enter his reign in the two-and-fortieth year from thence; as he will readily see, that shall make such a chronical table as is mentioned.

The original words, therefore, בן ארבעים ושתים שנה, are not to be translated as they be, “Ahaziah was two-and-forty years old,” but “Ahaziah was *the son of the* two-and-forty years;” as Seder Olam hath acutely observed long ago.

Now the reason why his reign is thus dated differently from all others the kings of Judah, is, because he, in a kind,

^f 2 Chron. xix and xx.

was an imp of the house of Omri: for Athaliah, his mother, was Ahab's daughter [2 Kings viii. 18]; and she both perverted her husband Joram, and brought up this her son, Ahaziah, in the idolatry of the house of Ahab: therefore is not Ahaziah fit to be reckoned by the line of the kings of Judah, but by the house of Omri and Ahab: see the evangelist Matthew setting a special mark upon the house of Joram, at the notes on Matt. i. 8.

6. There is yet one scruple more arising, concerning the beginning of the reign of this Ahaziah. For the same Book of Kings saith, that he began to reign in the twelfth year of Joram, the son of Ahab, 2 Kings viii. 25; and in the eleventh year of Joram, the son of Ahab, 2 Kings ix. 29.

Answer: The resolution of this doubt will be easy to him, that hath such a chronical table, as we have spoken of, before his eyes. For there will he see, that Jehoram reigned one year before his father Ahab's death: for in the twentieth year of Ahab, which was the seventeenth of Jehoshaphat, did Ahaziah, the son of Ahab, begin to reign [1 Kings xxii. 51], being made viceroy, when his father went to Ramoth-gilead.

He reigning but that year, Jehoram, his son, was viceroy, or began to rule in his stead, the next year,—namely, in Ahab's one-and-twentieth. Ahab, in his two-and-twentieth, died: and so Jehoram became absolute and entire king, and reigned so eleven years: so that his reign hath a double reckoning; he reigned as viceroy twelve years,—but, as entire king, but eleven.

7. Amaziah began to reign in the second year of Joash, king of Israel, 2 Kings xiv. 1; this was the eight-and-thirtieth year of his father, Joash, king of Judah, three years current before his death. And the reason was, because his father had cast himself into so much misery and mischief, through his apostasy, and murder of Zachariah^s, that he was become unfit and unable to manage the kingdom.

8. Uzziah, or Azariah, the son of this Amaziah, being but sixteen years of age, in the seven-and-twentieth year of the reign of Jeroboam the second [2 Kings xv. 1, 2], it appeareth, that he was but four years old at his father's death: therefore was the throne empty for eleven years, and the rule managed by some, as protectors, in the king's minority.

9. There is also an interregnum, or vacancy, of twenty-

^s 2 Kings, xii. 17, 18. 2 Chron. xxiv. 23—25.

two years, in the kingdom of Israel, between Jeroboam the second, and Zachariah: whereof what the reason should be, is not easy to determine: whether, through wars from abroad, which Jeroboam might have provoked against his house, by the conquest of Hamath and Damascus^h; or through war at home, as appeareth by the end of Zachariahⁱ; or through what else it was, it is uncertain,—but most sure it was, that the throne was so long without a king: since Jeroboam, beginning to reign in the fifteenth year of Amaziah, and reigning forty-one years^j, died in the fifteenth of Uzziah; and Zachariah began not to reign till the eight-and-thirtieth^k.

10. Hoshea is said to slay Pekah, in the twentieth year of Jotham, the son of Uzziah [2 Kings xv. 30]; whereas Jotham reigned but sixteen years in all, 2 Kings xv. 33. But the reason of this accounting is, because of the wickedness of Ahaz, in whose reign this occurrence was; and the Holy Ghost chooseth rather to reckon by holy Jotham in the dust, than by wicked Ahaz alive. For in the slaughter of Pekah, the Lord avenged upon Pekah, the bloodshed and misery he had caused in Judah; for he had slain of the men thereof, one hundred and twenty thousand in one day^l. Now Ahaz had caused this wrath upon the people, in withdrawing them from the ways of the Lord: therefore, when the Lord avengeth this injury of his people upon Pekah, the time of it is computed from Jotham, who was holy and upright,—and not from Ahaz, who had caused the mischief.

11. There is a scruple of no small difficulty about the reckoning of this twentieth year of Jotham, if it once be spied out: and that is this; If Pekah began to reign in the two-and-fiftieth, or last year of Uzziah, and reigned twenty years, as 2 Kings xv. 27;—and if Jotham began to reign in the second year of Pekah, 2 Kings xv. 33;—then, certainly, the twentieth year of Pekah, the year when Hoshea slew him, was but the nineteenth year of Jotham, and not the twentieth.

Answer: In this very difficulty, hath the text fixed the time of Uzziah's becoming leprous, which elsewhere is not determined: and it sheweth, that it was in the last year of his reign, when he essayed to offer incense in the temple, and was struck with the leprosy; a disease, with which the

^h 2 Kings, xiv. 23.

ⁱ 2 Kings, xv. 10.

^j 1 Kings, xiv. 23.

^k 2 Kings, xv. 8.

^l 2 Chron. xxviii. 6.

priests, who were to be the judges of it, could not be touched nor infected: and his son Jotham was over the house judging the land^m, till the day of his death. Now that last year of Uzziah is counted for the first of Jotham, in this reckoning that we have in hand; and although he began to reign as absolute and sole king in the second year of the reign of Pekah, yet began he to reign as viceroy, in the diseasedness of his father, the year before.

12. It is saidⁿ Hoshea, the son of Elab, began to reign in the twelfth year of Ahaz; whereas, he had slain Pekah in the fourth of Ahaz, or the twentieth of Jotham: which sheweth, that he obtained not the crown immediately upon Pekah's death, but was seven or eight years, before he could settle it quietly upon his head. It is like, that Ahaz, in this time, did disquiet Israel, when his potent enemy Pekah was dead, in revenge of that slaughter that he had made in Judah; and that he kept Hoshea out of the throne; and for this is called the king of Israel [2 Chron. xxviii. 19], as well as for walking in the ways of those kings.

13. It is said^o, that Hezekiah began to reign in the third year of Hoshea, the son of Elab. Now Hoshea beginning in the twelfth of Ahaz^p, it is apparent that Hezekiah began in the fourteenth; and so reigned two or three years with his father Ahaz, who reigned sixteen years^q.

The reason of this was, because of the wickedness of Ahaz, and because of the miseries and entanglements that his wickedness had brought him into^r. And this sheweth the zeal of Hezekiah, in the work of reformation, the more, in that he essayed and perfected it so much in the very time of his wicked father.

14. But, yet, there ariseth another doubt in the computation of the times of Hezekiah, parallel with the times of Hoshea: for, whereas he began to reign in the third year of Hoshea, as is clear before, then the seventh year of Hoshea should be counted his fifth year, and yet it is called but his fourth, 2 Kings xviii. 9.

Answer: The beginning of Hezekiah's reign, is of a double date: he began, indeed, to be viceroy, and to bear the rule, in the third of Hoshea, which was the fourteenth

^m 2 Kings, xv. 5.

^o 2 Kings, xviii. 1.

^q 2 Kings, xvi. 2.

ⁿ 2 Kings, xvii. 1.

^p 2 Kings, xvii. 1.

^r As 2 Chron. xxviii. 16—18. and xxix. 7—9.

year of his father Ahaz ; but the time of that year was but short, that he was in the royalty, and he did but little or nothing of note that year : but the next year, which was the fifteenth of Ahaz, and the fourth of Hoshea, on the very first day of the year, or the first of Nisan, he began the reformation, and stirred bravely in the restoring of religion^s; and, therefore, that is owned, as the most remarkable and renowned beginning of his dominion : and so the seventh of Hoshea, and his fourth year, fall in together. In his sixth year, the ten tribes are captived^t. And so the paralleling of the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel in their chronical annals is at an end : and now, the times of the kingdom of Judah, lie in an easy and continued chronicle, to the captivity in Babel, without any great scruple. Only about those turbulent times of Jehoachaz, and Jehoiakim, there is a little difficulty : for there passed some years between the death of Josiah, and the reign of Jehoiakim, in troubles and distempers, though the text hath mentioned the three months only of Jehoachaz : the gross sum of 390, between the division and the burning of the temple, keepeth all right, and showeth how much space this was, when all the other particulars are taken up ; as the 480, between the delivery out of Egypt, and building of Solomon's temple, do by the time of the rule of Joshua, though the text expressly hath not determined it.

So that now add these 390 years, mentioned by Ezekiel, which was the exact space between the falling away of the ten tribes, and the destruction of Jerusalem,—to the 3030 years, of which age the world was, when the ten tribes fell away ; and we find that Jerusalem was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, and the Babylonians, in the year of the world 3420.

SECTION VII.

From the burning of the Temple by Nebuzar-adan [2 Kings xxv, Jer. lii], to the Return from Babel [2 Chron. xxxvi. 22, Ezra i. 1], were 50 Years.

It hath been no small controversy among the learned, that have handled the current of these times that we are about, where to begin the seventy years of the captivity^u in Babel, so renowned in the Scripture. For since there

^s 2 Chron. xxix. 3.

^t 2 Kings, xviii. 10.

^u Jer. xxv. 11, 12, and xxix. 10. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21. Zech. i. 12.

were three captivities of Jerusalem, by the Babylonian,—namely, in the third year of Jehoiakim^v; in the year of Jehoiachin^w; and in the eleventh of Zedekiah^x,—it may very well be questioned, where those seventy years of captivity did begin, and where those 390 years, from the falling away of the ten tribes, should terminate.

To omit varieties of opinions and reasons that fix these periods, some here, some there; these reasons do plainly and sufficiently demonstrate, that the seventy years of Judah's captivity in Babel, did begin from the third year of Jehoiakim:—

First; Because Daniel, that measured out the whole space of that captivity, and that giveth account of the state of the people at that time, beginneth from thence, Dan. i.

Secondly; Because it is most proper to begin the seventy years' captivity by Babel from the very first time, that any captivity by Babel began.

Thirdly; It is prophesied by Jeremiah [chap. xxv. 11], that not only the Jews, but also all nations round about them, should serve the king of Babel seventy years. So that those seventy years are to be counted, the time and space of the absolute monarchy of Babel; and they are to begin from the beginning of Nebuchadnezzar, the first monarch.

Now, the beginning of his monarchy is easy to settle,—viz. in the third of Jehoiakim,—from these texts; Jer. xxxii. 1, and lii. 12. It is true, indeed, that, in Jer. xxv. 1, the fourth of Jehoiakim is called his first; and so it might be very well: for the first of Nebuchadnezzar might take up part of two years of his reign, as any one year of the king takes up much time of two lord-mayors, he entering his year in the spring, and they in autumn. Thus do the seventy years begin from the beginning of Nebuchadnezzar; but the 390, that we have been so long upon, do not there end, but they end at this nineteenth, or at the eleventh of Zedekiah,—when the city and temple were utterly ruined, and the captivity was entirely consummate; as the chain of the years, drawn out to the length, does really fix it;—and as the very intent and style of the prophet doth the like, who, in that sum, doth comprehend the whole time of the people's being in their own land, after the revolt under Jeroboam. So that nineteen years complete, out

^v 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6. Dan. i. 1.

^w 2 Chron. xxxvi. 9, 10.

^x 2 Kings, xxv. 2, 3. Jer. lii. 4, 5.

of the seventy, must we take into that sum; and so there are but fifty years, of that captivity, to the time of their delivery under Cyrus, remaining; which sum being added to the age of the world, at the burning of the temple, 3420, doth make the world to be 3470 years old, at the first of Cyrus, when the captivity did return.

SECTION VIII.

From the Return of the Jews out of Babel, to the Death of Christ, 490 Years.

THIS is so plain in Dan. ix, in the seventy weeks, or seventy times seven years, there mentioned, from the commandment going forth from Cyrus, to restore and build Jerusalem, to the cutting off of the Messias,—that it needeth as little to confirm it, as to tell, that seventy times seven is four hundred and ninety. For, if the angel speak not of a fixed and certain time in this sum, he nameth this sum to no purpose in the world: but he doth so clearly fix the time, the two ‘termini’ of its extent, and some particular links of it, as it passed, that nothing can be more clear, evident, and perspicuous. Now, add these 490 years, which reach to the death of Christ, to the age of the world, 3470, at the time when they began,—and it resulteth, that our Saviour died in the year of the world 3960. Out of which subduct the two-and-thirty years of our Saviour’s life, and it appeareth, that he was born in the year of the world 3928, that year being then but newly begun, ‘stylo veteri,’ or according to the account used from the beginning of the world, from Tisri, or September: so that that year was his first year; and 3929 his second year,—at the which, the wise men came to visit him; 3930, his third year; and so 3960, half passed, or at Easter, his two-and-thirtieth and a half, at which age he died.

And now, he that desireth to know the year of the world, which is now passing over us,—this year, 1644,—will find it to be 5572 years just now finished since the creation; and the year 5573 of the world’s age, now newly begun, this September, at the equinox.

HARMONY OF THE
THE
HARMONY
OF
THE FOUR EVANGELISTS.

First Part.

SECTION I.

LUKE, I.

*The Preface, or Epistle Dedicatory: the Occasion and Warranty
of Luke's writing the Gospel.*

Ver. 1. "FORASMUCH as many have taken in hand^a to set forth^b in order a declaration of those things, which are most surely^c believed among us;

2. Even as they delivered^d them unto us, which, from the beginning, were eye-witnesses, and ministers of the word:

3. It seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first^e, to write unto thee, in order^f, most excellent Theophilus;

^a Ἐπεχείρησαν, used for a lawful undertaking, and a successful progress in it, in Plat. in Phædro concerning Isocrates; and in Isocrates himself, ad Demonic.

^b To 'compile a narration,' Syr. Erasm. Bruciol. &c.

^c Πεπληροφορημένα: It signifieth, in Scripture style, not only the certainty of the things done, but also the certain belief that they were so done. See Rom. iv. 21, and xiv. 5: Col. ii. 2: 1 Thess. i. 5: 2 Tim. iv. 5: Heb. vi. 11. The LXX once use it in a bad sense, Eccles. viii. 11, for settlement in evil.

^d Παρέδωκαν: Here were traditions, of the highest form, that ever were any, delivered by Christ's own disciples, and generally believed and entertained, yea, and committed to writing, and yet made nothing worth in comparison of Scripture.

^e Or, 'from above.'

^f 'In order;' either in order to those that have written before; 'As they have done, so it seemed good to me to do also after them,' as Καθεξῆς is used, Acts iii. 24: or, in order of story, for the general, as to lay down Christ's conception, circumcision, baptism, preaching, death, resurrection, methodically, and as one followed another; but, for the particulars of Christ's journeys, miracles, speeches, &c. we shall find, in the progress of the story, that he doth not so precisely observe the very order; so that the former sense doth seem to be the better.

4. That^s thou mightest know the certainty of those things, wherein thou hast been instructed."

Reason of the Order.

Forasmuch as none of the evangelists have made a preface to their story, but only Luke,—this of his may serve as a general one for all the rest; and, like the Beautiful gate of the temple, may be as an entrance, or inlet, into the glorious and royal fabric of the Gospels.

HARMONY AND EXPLANATION.

Ver. 1: "*Many have taken in hand.*"

He condemneth not the undertakings of these men, as very many expositors hold he doth: for, first, he saith, they had taken in hand a declaration of those things, "which were most surely believed." Secondly; He saith, they had done it, even as the eye-witnesses and ministers had delivered it. Thirdly; He maketh his own undertaking of the like nature with theirs, when he saith, It seemed good "to me also:"—but he mentioneth these their writings, as only human authorities [undertaken without the injunction of the Holy Ghost], which his divine one was to exclude: so the books of Jasher, of Gad, of Iddo, of the wars of the Lord, &c, are cited by the Old Testament, neither as altogether disapproved, nor yet approved above human. In the loss of them, there perished none of the canonical Scriptures, but only the works of men; no more did there in the loss of these.

Ver. 2: "Eye-witnesses."] These were the twelve apostles.—"Ministers."] These were the seventy disciples. From their sermons and relations, many undertook to write gospels, of a godly intention and holy zeal. Of which the evangelist here speaking, aimeth neither at the Gospel of Matthew nor Mark, though they were written when he thus speaketh; for the first was an "eye-witness," and one of the twelve;—and the other, it is like, "a minister," or one of the seventy: and so wrote, not from the intelligence of others, as those did of whom the evangelist speaketh, but by their own.

Ver. 3: "It seemed good to me also, having had perfect

§ 1. Luke held it not unlawful, nor unfit, for a layman to read the Scriptures.
2. He held not ignorance to be the mother of devotion,—nor an implicit faith, sufficient for salvation.

understanding of all things *from above*.”] For so might *Ἀνωθεν* be best translated; and so it signifieth, John, iii. 3. 31, and xix. 11; James, i. 17, &c. And, thus taken, it showeth Luke’s inspiration from heaven, and standeth in opposition to the many gospels mentioned ver. 1;—which were written from the mouths and dictating of men, ver. 2; but his intelligence for what he writeth, was “from above.”

“Most excellent^h Theophilus.”] In most probability, a nobleman of Antioch, and fellow-citizen with Luke; converted by Paul, at his preaching there, Acts xi. 26. Luke adhered to his master, and forsook him not, 2 Tim. iv. 11; but Theophilus, staying at Antioch, after Paul’s departure, what he wanted in verbal instructions from the mouth of his master, when he went away, Luke doth, in this his Gospel, supply by writing,—that so he might know the certainty of these things, wherein he had been catechizedⁱ.

‘Theophilus,’ in Greek, is the same in signification with ‘Jedidiah,’ in Hebrew, the name of Solomon, “the Lord’s beloved;” or with the glorious title of Abraham, “the friend of God.”

And thus was that prophecy most sweetly fulfilled^j; “The sons of the afflicters shall come bending to thee,” &c; when in that town, which had been the residence, and bare the name, of Antiochus [the sharpest enemy that ever Israel groaned under], the professors of the gospel were first named Christians, and such an evangelist hath his original.

SECTION II.

The Fitness and Necessity of the Second Person in the Trinity’s being incarnate, and his being the Redeemer, rather than either of the other, asserted and proved, by his being the Creator, the Giver of the Promise, and Substance and Tenor of the Types and Prophecies of the Old Testament.

JOHN, I.

Ver. 1. “IN the beginning was the Word^k, and the Word was with God, and the Word^l was God.

^h Κράτιστε : an epithet for men of rank, as Acts, ii. 4, 3, and xxvi. 25.

ⁱ Κατηχήθη. See Acts, xviii. 25, and xxi. 2. Rom. ii. 18. 1 Cor. xiv. 19. Col. vi. 6.

^j Isa. lx. 14.

^k ‘Not pronounced, but substantial; not the voice of an articulate speech, but the begotten substance of the divine efficacy.’ Ignat. Martyr in Epist. ad Magnes. So Clem. Alex. Strom. 5.

^l Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος. The article, joined to Λόγος, sheweth, that that is the subject,—and Θεός, that wanteth it, the predicate.

2. The same was in the beginning with God.
3. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made, that was made^m.
4. In him was life; and the life was the light of men.
5. And the light shined in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not.
6. There was a man sent from Godⁿ, whose name was John.
7. The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the Light, that all men, through him, might believe.
8. He^o was not that Light; but was sent to bear witness of that Light.
9. That was the true Light^p, which lighteth every man, that cometh into the world.
10. He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not.
11. He came unto^q his own, and his own received him^r not.
12. But as many as received him^r, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name:
13. Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.
14. And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us,

^m Some end the sentence here, and some but begin it, and some neither, but bring it a step farther: some point thus; "All things were made by him, and without him was nothing made. That which was made in him, was life:" a reading which Chrysostom [Hom. 5. in Job] saith, was used by heretics, whereby to prove the Holy Ghost to be a creature. And this is the very reading of the Vulgar Latin. Others have read it thus: "All things were made by him; and without him was nothing made, which was made in him:" and then they began a new sentence, "He was life," &c. A reading, conceived to have been used by the Manichees, whereby to prove 'duo principia,' a good, and a bad.

ⁿ From Mal. iii. 1, and iv. 5. And thus do the two Testaments join together.

^o The Baptist was a light [John, v. 35]; but not that Light that was to come: as the light of the three first days of the creation, without the sun.

^p It may be either read, "which, coming into the world, lighteth every man;" or, as our English hath it: which latter is approved the true; 1. By the very place where the word 'coming,' or ἐρχόμενον, lieth; for it followeth not immediately the word φῶς, but ἀνθρώπων; and so being joined with it, reason and the custom of grammar tell, that it should be construed with it. 2. It is ordinary among the Jews to call men by this periphrasis באי עולם, "such as come into the world;" which idiom of the Hebrews, the evangelist followeth here. The Syriac readeth as we do.

^q As it were 'into his own house;' or, among his own people, as John, xvi. 32, and xix. 27. Acts, iv. 23, and xxi. 6.

^r In ver. 11, it is Παρέλαβον; in ver. 12, it is ἔλαβον; which, though they signify the same thing, yet might some distinction of sense be observed, in the distinction of words: for Christ came among the Jews bodily, yet they would not so much as receive him bodily, nor acknowledge him for Messias at all; but coming among the Gentiles by his word and Spirit, they received him spiritually.

(and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten^s of the Father), full of grace and truth.”

Reason of the Order.

The preface being made, the story is to begin; and that it doth here, from Christ's divinity, most divinely. For whereas the other evangelists begin their relations no farther back, than from the birth, or conception, of our Saviour; or, at the farthest, of his forerunner,—John draws the reader back to behold him, in the Old Testament, in the creation of the world, and in the promises to the fathers. And, therefore, this portion is first to be begun withal; and, of itself, will justify its own order. Especially it being considered, that the person of Christ is first to be treated of, before his actions;—and, in his person, the divine nature [which John here handleth], before the human.

HARMONY AND EXPLANATION.

From Gen. i. 1, the evangelist sheweth, that the redemption was to be wrought by him, by whom the creation was,—namely, by the ‘Word,’ or the second person in the Trinity, as being fittest for that great work: as whereby confusion, both in the external works of the Trinity, as also in the term of sonship, might be avoided:—in the external works of the Trinity, when the Creator of man became his Redeemer; and in the term of sonship, when the Son of God, and the Son of man, were but one and the same person.

Ver. 1: “The Word.”] He is so called in the Old Testament. First, As the author of the creation, Psal. xxxiii. 6. Secondly, As the author of the promise, 2 Sam. vii. 21^t, compared with 1 Chron. xvii. 19. Thirdly, As the very subject of the covenant and promise itself; Hag. ii. 5. Deut. xxx. 12, compared with Rom. x. 6, 7. So that, these things being laid together and well considered, they show why John calleth the Son of God ‘the Word,’ rather than by any other name. First, Because he would show, that, as the world was created by the Son, so it was most fit it

^s As : אמרת Kimchi in Miclol: as Num. xi. 1, ‘The people became as murmurers:’ Prov. x. 20, “The heart in the wicked is as little worth:” that is, “very murmurers;” “very little worth;” so here, “The very glory of the only begotten.”

^t 2 Sam. vii. 21, “For thy word's sake;” which, in 1 Chron. xvii. 19, is expressed, “For thy servant's sake;” the title of Christ, Isa. xlii. 1.

should be redeemed. Secondly, That as, in him, the promise was given,—so, in him, was fit should be the performance. Thirdly, That, as he was the subject of the covenant, in the Old Testament,—so also was he the substance of it in the New.

From such places, as these forenamed, where the Son of God is called the ‘Word,’ in the Old Testament, it became most familiar and ordinary, among the Jews, to use this title personally for him. And this may be a second reason deduced from that, that was named before, why the evangelist here useth it,—namely, as a name most familiarly and commonly known amongst his own people. Examples hereof might be alleged out of the Chaldee paraphrast, even by hundreds. It will suffice to allege some few: “If the word of the Lord will be my help, &c. The word of the Lord shall be my God^v.” “Moses brought forth the people to meet the word of the Lord^w.” “Your appointed feasts my word abominateth^x,” and, “Put away the evil of your doings from before my word^y,” and, “My word shall go before thee^z,” &c. So Isa. xlvi. 11, xlix. 5. 15, and li. 5; Jer. xxiv. 6, xxvii. 5. 18, and xxix. 14, 23; Hos. i. 7. 9; Zech. ii. 5; and in hundreds of other places. And so, likewise, in some of the writings of the Talmudists; and Philo Judæus, in lib. ‘De mundi opificio,’ explaineth this title.

This term, and in this sense also, was got even among the heathen: for so Mercurius Trismegistus useth it often in Pimandro: as, “The will of God contained his word.” And, “God, with his word, produced another intellect, which is a fiery God, and a divine Spirit.” And again, “The word of God compacted the pure workmanship of nature.” And, “The working intellect, together with the word.”

So, likewise, Orpheus, as he is alleged by Justin Martyr:—

Οὐρανὸν ὀρκίζω σε Θεοῦ μεγάλου σοφοῦ ἔργον,
 Αὐδὴν ὀρκίζω σε Πατρός^a, &c.

But Mahomet, in his Alcoran, goeth yet farther: “Eise, or Jesus (saith he), is the Word of God: and this, being the Word of God, is reputed among the Saracens, as the proper name of Jesus Christ; so that no other man is called

^v Gen. xxviii. 20, 21. ^w Exod. xix. 17. ^x Isa. i. 14. ^y Ver. 16. ^z Chap. xlv. 2.

^a “I adjure thee, by the heaven, &c. I adjure thee, by the word of the Father.”

by this name, but Jesus only; whom, in Arabic, they call Eise^b.”

“And the Word was with God^c,” &c.] The evangelist goeth not about so much, immediately to show the eternity of the Word, or of the second person in the Trinity, as he doth to declare, how requisite it was, that that person should be incarnate, rather than the first, or the third; because, by him the creation was wrought; and, answerably, by him it was fittest should be the redemption, &c. Therefore, the words, “in the beginning,” have not reference to the Word’s eternal being, but to his giving of being to the creature. For, as they are Moses’s own phrase^d,—so are they to be taken in his sense; and farther back than the creation, it is not possible to bring his words; and by those of his, must these be understood. They trace not, therefore, his divinity beyond the creation; nor yet do they find it to have begun there; but this they say only, that then “the Word” was; and, by him were all things made. And this was enough for the answering of Ebion and Cerinthus, which held, that Christ was not before the Virgin Mary. And this being concluded, that the Word was in the beginning, and created all things,—his eternal being, before the creation, will readily infer itself.

The evangelist useth this manner of speech, “The Word with God,”—

First, To show the subsistence of the Son of himself, and his co-existence with the Father: his subsistence, “he was;” his co-existence, “he was with God.”—Secondly; The distinction of the persons, “he was with God:” and the unity of the essence, “he was God.”—Thirdly; The relation between the Father and the Son. The Son is said to be “with the Father,” as children are, ‘*apud patrem*,’ but not ‘*e contra*.’—Fourthly; The phrase, “he was with God,” is in antithesis, or opposition, to that that is said afterward, “The Word dwelt among us.” And this doth illustrate the doctrine and benefit of the incarnation the more, when it shall be observed, that he, that, in the beginning, “was the Word,” and “was with God,” and “was the Creator,” did, in the fulness of time, become flesh, and dwell with men; and became their Redeemer.

^b Sam. Maroch. lib. de Adventu Messiae, cap. 27. Drus. in Præter. in loc.

^c Prov. viii. 27. 30.

^d Gen. i. 1.

“And the Word was God.”] God, in the clause next preceding, is taken personally, for God the Father; but here, essentially, for the Godhead.

Moses, all along the story of the creation, called God ‘Elohim,’ by a word plural, to denote the distinction of persons: but, at last, in Gen. ii. 4, he calleth him ‘Jehovah Elohim,’ to signify, also, the unity of essence. So David, when he had spoken of “the Lord and his word^e,” and “the Lord and his servant^f,” he presently concludeth, that there is but one God; though those titles might seem to make them more: “There is none like thee, neither is there any God besides thee^g.” So the evangelist, here, when he hath named ‘the Word,’ and ‘God,’ and ‘the Word being with God,’ as two persons, distinct one from another;—lest this distinction should breed the supposal of difference, and the mention of more persons, the surmised of more Gods, he preventeth betimes and stoppeth all misconstructions, by saying, “the Word was God.”

Ver. 2: “The same was in the beginning with God.”] He had said the same thing immediately before, but not in the same respect. For there he spake of the Word’s co-existence with the Father; as he explaineth himself after it, “the Word was God:” but here he speaketh of the Word’s co-working with the Father, in the works of the creation; and, accordingly, explaineth himself after also, “by him were all things made.”

Ver. 3: “By him were all things made.”] Not as an instrumental cause only, as the Arians pleaded, but as the efficient; for so the word *by* often importeth; 1 Cor. i. 9. 1 Thess. v. 9. 2 Cor. i. 1. Prov. viii. 15, 16. Eph. i. 1. Col. i. 1. And so may *ἐν* be understood, Col. i. 16.

“And, without him, was nothing made, that was made.”] In this place there hath been great difference of readings, as was observed before: as, see Chrys. in loc. Vulg. Lat. and Alcuin. in loc. &c: but Ignatius Martyr^h, Tatianusⁱ, Chrysostom^k, and other of the ancients,—and the Arabic, Syriac, Italian, Spanish, French, Dutch, and all Latin translations, that are not wedded to the Vulgar, read as we do; and so the very sense of the place requireth to read. And so some of the Romanists themselves read, forsaking

^e 2 Sam. vii. 21.

^f 1 Chron. xvii. 19.

^g 2 Sam. vii. 22.

^h Epist. ad Antioch.

ⁱ In Harmon.

^k In loc.

their own Vulgar: as the Rhemists, in margin, Maldonat. &c. For how crabbed, harsh, and strained, a sense the best is, that can be made of their reading, see in Alcuin. in loc. Victorinum adversus Arium, lib. 3; Aquin. part. 1. quæst. 18. art. 4.

Concerning the repetition of this, it being the same in effect with that before, “All things were made by him;” observe, that, first, it is to heighten the expression, or to enforce the sense; for so the Hebrews usually do by an affirmative and negative in the same sentence¹. Secondly, That the two distinct clauses may seem to distinguish of the creatures; and, in the affirmative, to understand the visible creatures, which, Moses had taught evidently, were made by the Word: and, in the negative, the invisible, of which there might be the more doubt, whether they were made by him or no, because Moses hath made no such plain expression. Or, thirdly, That the affirmative may mean ‘the Word’s creating of all things;’ and the negative, ‘his disposal and ordering of all things;’ *χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν*, “without him was nothing that hath been,” either created, or disposed^m.

Ver. 4: “In him was lifeⁿ.”] This hath allusion to Adam’s naming his wife Eve, or life, upon the apprehension of the promise given him after his fall, Gen. iii. 20.

And, the evangelist having considered the Word, in the former verse, as the author of nature,—he cometh now to treat of him, as the author of grace: there, as the Creator; here, as the Redeemer. For, having related there, that “by him all things were made,” and, amongst all things, man received his natural life and being;—he goeth on now to show, that by the same Word also, man, when he was fallen, and perished, and had incurred the penalty of dying the death, he re-obtained a new and a better life,—namely, by faith, and laying hold upon him in the promise^o.

“And the life was the light^p of men.”] The life of the promise was the light, that shone in the world, and to which all the patriarchs and prophets, and all the holy men of God, that lived before the fulfilling of it, had an eye and respect, as to a light shining in a dark place; and whereby they

¹ 2 Kings, xx. 15. Jer. xxxviii. 25. Lam. iii. 2.

^m John, v. 17.

ⁿ Deut. xxx. 20. Psal. lxi. 9. Prov. iv. 13. John, v. 24, vi. 35, and xx. 31. Col. iii. 3, 4. 1 John, v. 12.

^o Hab. ii. 4.

^p Eph. v. 14. 1 Pet. ii. 9. 1 John, ii. 8.

guided all their devotions, and whereto they aimed all their actions. And this light then shone, and yet shineth^a, in all the types, shadows, figures, and predictions, of the law, and of the prophets, as we daily read them. And that darkness^r and mystical cloudiness, which lay over them, did not comprehend^s it, but that it gave some shine in that obscureness; and yet did they not reach to that brightness of revealing of Christ, but that it was necessary that the gospel should be preached: the beginning of which is mentioned in the very next verse,—namely, the preaching of John.

Ver. 6: “There was a man sent,” &c.] Here may the reader look back, and see the method and intention of the evangelist, and the reason why he calleth him by this name, ‘the Word,’ rather than any other. For, first, He was the Word by whom all things, and among them man, were created. Secondly; The Word, by which man, being fallen, was recovered, and obtained life. Thirdly; The Word of light, direction, and consolation, to the holy patriarchs. Fourthly; The Word of promise, in the darkness of the law and prophets. And he is now come to be the Word incarnate, and the publisher of the gospel, which began from John^t. And thus hath the evangelist made the whole Old Testament, no other than a veiled gospel, speaking of Christ, though somewhat obscurely, from the beginning to the end; as, in the creation, ver. 3; in the promise, ver. 4; in the expectation of the fathers, *ibid*; in the darkness of the law and prophets, ver. 5; and in the necessity of a clearer revelation of him by his own coming, *ibid*.

Ver. 7: “To bear witness of the Light,” &c.] The ‘Light,’ in this verse, and those that follow, is taken personally for Christ himself; whereas, in ver. 4, 5, it is taken virtually only there, for the light that flowed from Christ; and, therefore, it is said, that light was *in* him;—here, for Christ, the light itself, for so is he called, ver. 9^u. For, first, Christ revealeth the Father, and his will^v; and whatsoever maketh manifest, is light^w. Secondly; He is the brightness of the glory, and express image, of the Father^x, who is a light without any darkness at all^y. Thirdly; He enlighteneth the

^a φαίνει.

^r See Isa. xxv. 7. xxxii. 3. ix. 2. 2 Cor. iii. 13. Heb. xii. 18.

^s “Non eo usque obruebant, quin,” &c: Leusden.

^t Mark, i. 1.

^u See Isa. x. 17. xlii. 6. xlix. 6. Micah, vii. 8. Num. xxiv. 17. Psal. lxxxiv. 1. Mal. iv. 2, &c.

^v John, i. 18. xvi. 25.

^w Ephes. v. 13.

^x Heb. i. 3.

^y 1 John, i. 5.

hearts of his by faith^y. Fourthly; Christ, held out in the gospel, filled the world full of the light of knowledge, in comparison of what it was under the law^z.

“That all might believe.”] The word *all* joineth the Gentiles with the Jews, which hitherto had been secluded; and in the same sense is Christ’s “lighting of every one that cometh into the world” כל בא עולם (ver. 9), to be understood, for his general and universal enlightening of the world with the shining of the gospel. For there is a comparison made here by the evangelist, betwixt the light of the promise under the law, and the light of the gospel and Christ in it.

Ver. 10: “He was in the world.”] Not virtually and invisibly only, in his power and providence; but even visibly, sensibly, and apparently, in audible voice, and conspicuous shape, before he came in human nature^a; yea, even to the sight and hearing of wicked and heathen men^b.

Ver. 11: “He came among his own.”] This speaketh of his incarnation, and of his own nation the Jews; amongst whom he came and conversed in human flesh, yet they refused him. They were *his own* by choice^c; by purchase^d; by covenant^e; and by kindred^f.

Ver. 12: “Power^g to become the sons of God.”] The people of the church are called, the “sons of God,” Gen. vi. 2. And after the dispersion at Babel [where the heathen became the “sons of men,” Gen. xi. 5], this title was appropriated only to the Jews^h; but now, when the Jews, Christ’s own people, should not receive him when he so came amongst them,—this privilege should be conferred upon what heathen or Gentiles soever should receive him, that they should be henceforward, as the Jews had been hitherto, ‘the sons of God,’ or the church of Christ.

“That believe on his name.”] That is, in, or on, him: for the ‘name of God,’ in Scripture, doth often stand for God himselfⁱ. “For God is without any mixture or composition, but a most pure and simple essence; and, therefore, his name and himself are not two several things, as they be in the creatures, but one and the same^j.”

^y Ephes. v. 14.

^z Isa. xi. 9. Psal. xix. 8, 9.

^a As Gen. xv. xviii. and xxxii. Exod. iii. Josh. vi.

^b Gen. iv. xx, xxi. and xxxi. Dan. iii. 24, 25. Exod. xiv.

^c Deut. vii. 6.

^d Exod. xix. 4, 5.

^e Deut. xxvi. 18.

^f Heb. ii. 16.

^g Or ‘privilege, dignity, or license,’ as *ἔξουσία* is used, 1 Cor. viii. 9. ix. 5, 6. Acts, v. 4. Matt. vii. 29. *ἔξουσία μάχεσθαι*, Arist. Eth. 8.

^h Exod. iv. 22. Hos. xi. 1. ⁱ As, Psal. lxxv. 1. Micah, vi. 9. Acts, iii. 16, &c.

^j R. Menahem, on Exod. vi.

Ver. 13: "Which are born not of blood."] Greek, not of 'bloods,' in the plural number: that is, not of the kindred, descent, or continued pedigree, from the patriarchal line, or the blood of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and successively: for John the evangelist speaketh much to the same tenor here, that John the Baptist doth, Matt. iii. 9; That Christ would adopt the heathen for the sons of God, as the Jews had been,—though they had no relation at all to the Jewish blood or stock.

"Nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man."] The evangelist hath traced Moses all along from the beginning of the chapter, and so he doth here. He used the phrase of the 'sons of God,' in the verse preceding, from Gen. vi. 2. And this clause, that we have in hand, he seemeth to take from the very next verse after; "My Spirit shall no more strive with man, because he also is flesh:" where, as Moses, by *flesh*, understandeth the brood of Cain, men that followed the swing of lust, sensuality, and their own corruption,—and by *man*, the family of Seth, or Adam, that was regulated by religion and reason, till that family grew also fleshly, like the other;—so doth John here the like. For having, in the next foregoing words, excluded one main thing (that was much stood upon) from any claim or challenge towards the adopting of the sons of God, or forwarding of the new birth,—and that is, descent from Abraham, and from those holy men successively, that had the promise; so doth he here as much for two other, which only can put in for title to the same; and those are, first, 'the will of the flesh,' or ability of nature; secondly, 'the will of man,' or power of morality.

Ver. 14: "And the Word became flesh^k."] Now hath the evangelist brought us to the great mystery of the incarnation:—in the description of which may be observed, first, the two terms, 'the Word,' and 'flesh,' expressing Christ's two natures; and the Word 'was made,' or 'became,' their hypostatical union:—secondly, the word 'flesh' is rather used by the evangelist, than the word 'man;' though oftentimes they signify but the same thing^l. First, To make the difference and distinction of the two natures in Christ, the more conspicuous; and that, according to the common speech of the

^k Apollinaris, from this clause, "the Word became flesh," would wickedly conclude, that the Word assumed not a human soul, but only human flesh, and that the Godhead served that flesh instead of a reasonable soul: confuted, Luke, v. 52; Matt. xxvi. 38.

^lAs, Gen. vi. 12. Psal. lxxv. 2. Isa. xl. 5, 6.

Jews, who set ‘flesh and blood’ in opposition to ‘God^m.’ Secondly; To magnify the mercy of God in Christ’s incarnation, the more, in that ‘flesh’ being, in its own nature, so far distant from the nature of God;—yet that he thus brought these two natures together, as of them to make but one person, for the reconciling of man and himself together. Thirdly; To confirm the truth of Christ’s humanity, against future heresies, which have held, that he had not a true and real human body, but only fantastical, or of the air. Fourthly; To explain what he said before, that believers ‘became the sons of God;’ that is, not by any change of their bodily substances, but by participation of divine grace: for Christ, on the contrary, became ‘the Son of man,’ by assuming of flesh, and not by changing into it. Fifthly; To show the plaster fitly applied unto the sore, and the physic to the disease; for whereas in us, that is, ‘in our flesh,’ there dwelleth no good, but sin, death, and corruption,—he took upon him this very nature, which we have so corrupted, sequestering only the corruption from it, that, in the nature, he might heal the corruption. Sixthly; He saith, he was made or became ‘flesh,’ and not, he was made ‘man,’ lest it should be conceived, that Christ assumed a person; for he took not the person of any man in particular, but the nature of man in general.

“Was made flesh.”] Not by alteration, but assumption; not by turning of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the manhood into God; not by leaving what he was before, that is, ‘to be God,’—but by taking on him what he was not before, that is, ‘to be man.’

And the evangelist saith rather, “He *was made* flesh,” than “he *assumed it*,” that he might set out the truth and mystery of the incarnation to the life, both for the hypostatical union of the two natures, and their inseparability, being so united. For, first, whereas Nestorius said, that “the Word was not that man, that was conceived and born of the Virgin Mary; but that the Virgin, indeed, brought forth a man; and he, having obtained grace in all kind of virtue, had the Word of God united unto him, which gave him power against unclean spirits;” and so he made two several sons, and two several persons, of the two natures;—his heresy is plainly and strongly confuted by this phrase, “he was made

^m As, Matt. xvi. 17. Gal. i. 16.

flesh," which, by the other, "he assumed it," might have had more pretext and colour. Secondly; Whereas Eutyches, Valentinus, and others, averred, that "Christ had not a true human body, but only a body in appearance; this also confuteth them home, and taketh away all probability of any such thing, which the word 'assumed' might have left more doubtful: since we know that angels assumed bodies, and those bodies were not truly human. So that in this manner of speech, "The Word was made flesh," is evidently taught,—First, That there are two distinct natures in Christ, the Godhead, and the manhood; for he saith not, the "Word was turned into," but was "made," or "became flesh." Secondly; That these two natures do not constitute two persons, but only one Christ; for he saith, "he was made flesh," and not "assumed it." Thirdly; That this union is hypostatical, or personal; for he saith, "the Word was made flesh," and not "joined to it." And, lastly; That this union is indissoluble, and never to be separated: for angels, in assumed bodies, laid them by again, and were parted from them; but "the Word being made flesh," the union is personal, and not to be dissolved.

"And dwelt among us," &c.] That is, "among us, his disciples:" for so the next clause, "we saw his glory," importeth: and this evangelist speaketh the same thing more at large, 1 John i. 1.

"Full of grace and truth."] For these words follow next in grammatical construction and connexion; lying thus; "And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth." The reason of the parenthesis, "and we saw his glory," may seem to be,—First, Because he would explain what he meant by *us*, before he left it; viz. us, disciples,—"that saw his glory." Secondly; Because the apostles beheld not the very fulness of his grace and truth, till they had beheld the fulness of that glory, which he showed on earth.

"Grace and truth."] As the soul hath two noble faculties, the understanding and the will, the objects of which are, 'verum et bonum,' 'truth and goodness;' so the whole tenor of Scripture doth run upon these two, and they are indeed the sum of allⁿ. Now Christ being the substance of the promises, which had the original from 'grace,' and their

ⁿ As Psal. xxv. 10. xl. 12. xxxvi. 5. and cxxxviii. 2. Hos. ii. 19, &c.

performance in ‘truth;’ they being “in him yea, and in him Amen;” the evangelist, saying, that “he dwelt among us, full of grace and truth,”—holdeth out, that he was the performance and accomplishment of all the promises of *grace*, and the *truth* of all the types and prophecies before the law, and under it, that tended to such a purpose; and in him was the fulness of that mercy and truth, that the patriarchs, prophets, and holy men, looked after; and he, the whole tenor, scope, and subject, of the Scriptures.

SECTION III.

The Conception and Birth of John the Baptist, and of Christ, foretold by the Angel Gabriel, &c.

LUKE, I.

Ver. 5. “THERE was in the days of Herod^o, the king of Judea, a certain priest named Zacharias, of the course of Abia; and his wife was of the daughters of Aaron^p, and her name was Elisabeth^q.

6. And they were both^r righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord, blameless.

7. And they had no child, because that Elisabeth^s was barren; and they both were now well^t stricken in years.

8. And it came to pass, that while he executed the priest’s office before^u God in the order of his course,

9. According to the custom of the priest’s office, his lot was to burn incense, when he went into the temple of the Lord.

10. And the whole multitude of the people were praying without at the time of incense.

11. And there appeared unto him an angel^v of the Lord standing on the right side of the altar of incense.

^o Herod, written with ה in the beginning, signifieth ‘fear,’ or ‘trembling;’ as the trembling cowardice of Gideon’s soldiers, named the well חרר Judg. vii. 1, &c. But the Syriac and Arabic write this with ה

^p John Baptist of the priestly line, both by father and mother.

^q These seventy call the wife of Aaron, the first priest, by the same name, Exod. vi. 23.

^r Such couples were Abraham and Sarai, Isaac and Rebekah, Elkanah and Hannah; both righteous, and a long time childless.

^s Throughout the Scripture, want of children is ascribed to the woman.

^t A Hebraism, as Gen. xviii. 11. 1 Kings, i. 1, &c.

^u The worship of God, in the temple, was said to be ‘before him,’ Exod. xxiii. 17; Lev. i. 3. 11: and the ark, being the representation of Christ, is called ‘his face,’ Psal. cv. 4: yea, even ‘God himself,’ Psal. cxxxii. 5.

^v Compare the appearing of the angel Gabriel to Daniel, about the time of incense, Dan. ix. 21.

12. And when Zacharias saw him, he was troubled^w, and fear fell upon him^x.

13. But the angel said unto him, 'Fear not, Zacharias: for thy prayer is heard; and thy wife Elisabeth shall bear thee a son, and thou shalt call his name John^y.

14. And thou shalt have joy^z and gladness; and many shall rejoice at his birth^a.

15. For he shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and shall drink neither wine nor strong drink^b; and he shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb^c.

16. And many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God.

17. And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias^d, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom^e of the just: to make ready a people prepared for the Lord.'

18. And Zacharias said unto the angel, 'Whereby shall I know this? for I am an old man^f, and my wife well stricken in years.'

19. And the angel answering said unto him, 'I am Gabriel^g, that stand in the presence of God; and am sent^h to speak unto thee, and to show thee these glad tidings.

20. And, beholdⁱ, thou shalt be dumb, and not able to speak, until the day that these things shall be performed, because thou believest not my words, which shall be fulfilled in their season^k.'

^w Ἐταράχθη, used by the LXX to express Pharaoh's trouble upon his dream, Gen. xli. 8; and his servants' upon theirs, Gen xl. 6. Compare Judg. vi. 22, and xiii. 22. Dan. viii. 17. Job, iv. 14. ^x As Gen. xv. 12.

^y John, the same with 'Jochanan,' so frequent in the Old Testament; as 1 Chron. iii. 15: vi. 9: xii. 12: and xxvi. 3. and 2 Chron. xvii. 15: xxiii. 1: and xxviii. 12. Jer. xl. 8.

^z As Job, iii. 22. The Arabic addeth, 'thou shalt have great joy.'

^a As Gen. xxi. 6.

^b Σίκερα: of the Hebrew, שכר used by the LXX for it, Lev. x. 9. Num. vi. 3. Isa. v. 11. and xxviii. 7, &c. which sometimes signifieth 'wine;' as Num. xxviii. 7: but most commonly any thing that will cause drunkenness. "Wine of forty days old, is called *Shikar*;" saith R. Menahem, on Lev. x: and so the Chaldee paraphraseth it, Num. vi. 3, and xxviii. 7. Judg. xiii. 4; "But any thing that will make one drunk, is called *Shikar*, whether it be made of corn, honey, or fruits." Ab. Ezr. on Lev. x, R. Kimch. in Miclol. Brucioli's Italian, and the French, express it by 'Cerevisia,' ale, or beer.

^c Ἀστέϊος τῷ Θεῷ; as Moses, Acts, vii. 20. Jer. i. 5.

^d Heb. אֱלִיָּהוּ. 1 Kings, xvii, &c; and there turned by the LXX, ἡλίου: but in Mal. iv. 5, the Hebrew hath it אֱלִיָּהוּ, and the LXX, ἡλίας.

^e Ἐν φρονήσει: In or by the wisdom.

^f As Gen. xviii. 12.

^g Dan. viii. 16. and ix. 21.

^h This relateth to his assuming a visible shape.

ⁱ So a sign is given to Ahaz, with a 'behold,' Isa. vii. 14; compare Ezek. iii. 26.

^k Εἰς καιρὸν, Matt. ii. 23; as εἰς χρόνον πικρίας, Acts, viii. 23.

21. And the people waited for Zacharias, and marvelled that he tarried so long in the temple.

22. And when he came out^j he could not speak unto them: and they perceived that he had seen a vision in the temple; for he beckoned unto them, and remained speechless.

23. And it came to pass, that as soon as the days of his ministration were accomplished, he departed to his own house.

24. And after those days his wife Elisabeth conceived, and hid herself five months^k, saying,

25. ‘Thus hath the Lord dealt with me, in the days wherein he looked on me^l, to take away my reproach among men.’

26. And IN THE SIXTH MONTH the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee^m, named Nazareth,

27. To a virgin espoused to a man, whose name was Josephⁿ, of the house of David; and the virgin’s name was Mary^o.

28. And the angel came in unto her, and said, ‘Hail, thou that art highly favoured, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women.’

29. And when she saw him, she was troubled at his saying, and cast in her mind what manner of salutation this should be.

30. And the angel said unto her, ‘Fear not, Mary: for thou hast found favour with God^p.’

31. And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb^q, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS.

^j At the first burning of incense, the priests miscarried, Lev. x; and thus, that rite, which the Jews value for the highest of all legal offerings, beginneth with ignorance, and concludeth with unbelief. Prophecy was struck dumb a great while ago, and now is the priesthood so, as well as it.

^k Observe the same space, if cast into months, Gen. vii. 24, and Rev. ix. 5.

^l So read also the Syrian and Arabic, though the words, ‘on me,’ be not expressed in the original, unless included in the preposition, in ἐπεὶ δὲν.

^m See 1 Kings, ix. 11. Isa. ix. 1; and in the LXX, in Joel, iii. 4. Ezek. xlvii. 8.

ⁿ This calleth to remembrance the old renowned patriarch, Joseph, Gen. xxxvii; both of them were sent into Egypt, and both by dreams; and there, the one nourished his father, and the other, his Redeemer. There were also, of this name, Joseph of Arimathea, and Joseph, surnamed Justus.

^o Gr. *Μαριάμ*; by which word the LXX render the name of Moses’s sister, Exod. xv, &c. The name plainly and properly signifieth both ‘their rebellion,’ and ‘their bitter affliction;’ for the wickedness of Israel, in Egypt, had brought them into great misery, when Miriam was so named.

^p Gen. vi. 9.

^q He useth the common manner of speech among the Hebrews, as Gen. iv. 1, &c. to show the true conception, and real birth, of our Saviour; confuting that heresy, “That he came through the Virgin’s womb, as through a conduit pipe, without partaking of her nature:” and that, “That he was not really born, but fantastically only, and in appearance.” These words refer to Isa. vii. 14.

32. He shall be great, and shall be called^a The Son of the Highest^r; and the Lord God^s shall give unto him the throne of his father David;

33. And he shall reign over the house of Jacob^t for ever; and of his kingdom^u there shall be no end.'

34. Then said Mary unto the angel, 'How^v shall this be, seeing I know^w not a man?'

35. And the angel answered and said unto her, 'The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee; and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also, that holy thing, which shall be born of thee^x, shall be called The Son of God.

36. And, behold, thy cousin Elisabeth^y, she hath also conceived a son in her old age: and this is the sixth month with her, who was called barren.

37. For with God nothing is impossible^z.'

38. And Mary said, 'Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word:' and the angel departed from her.

39. And Mary arose in those days, and went into the hill-country with haste, into a city of Judah^a;

^a "Shall be called The Son of the Highest;" that is, shall be his Son, as Isa. i. 26, and iv. 3; and shall be so confessed.

^r Gen. xiv. 19.

^s Jehovah Elohim.

^t Isa. ii. 5.

^u Isa. ix. 7. Dan. vii. 14. Mic. iv. 7. Psal. cxlv. 14. Heb. vii. 17.

^v *How*, in Scripture, is sometime a strong asseveration, or negation, Lam. i. 1. Gen. xxxix. 9, and xlv. 34: sometime a question of doubting, as John, vi. 52, and iii. 4: and sometime a question of ignorance only, without diffidence; or a question desiring information, or resolution, as John, vii. 15. Luke, xx. 44. And so is it here; for the Virgin believeth the thing, ver. 45: but desired to be satisfied of the manner; for she saith not, 'How *can*,' but 'How *shall* this be?'

^w A modest phrase for carnal copulation. First used of Adam, presently after the relation of his eating of the tree of knowledge, Gen. iv. 1; as if it would show, that all the knowledge he gained by that, was but carnal; 'he knew his wife;' and, experimental of misery, 'they knew they were naked.'

^x Born of thee; so read the Syriac, Arabic, Justin Martyr in Dialog., Nazianz. Orat. 59, Aponius in Cantic., Titus in loc. &c; but some copies dangerously want it; as the text of Theophylact; H. Steph., 1604, and Amsterdam, 1632; Erasmus, &c.

^y The certain bond of their kindred cannot be determined: but Elisabeth, or her mother, might be sister to Mary's father, or mother; or Mary's mother's mother, might be so to her, or hers, or to Zacharias, or his. However, it sheweth, that Christ and John the Baptist were nearly allied, according to the flesh; yet, John knew him not, till he was revealed to him by the Spirit.

^z Gen. xviii. 14.

^a The division of Judea is famous and frequent, into the Mountains,—the Plain,—and the South; Num. xiii. 29. Jer. xxxii. 44, &c. The South lay towards Seir and Amalek, from the inlets into the land, at the utmost part of the dead sea; having the Philistines upon the west. This part reached to the rising of the mountains, not far below Hebron: and there the mountains began, and ran along northward to, and beyond, Jerusalem,—having the flat, or the plain, of Jordan skirting up all along upon their east side, till Samaria and Galilee brought in another denomination.

40. And entered into the house of Zacharias, and saluted Elisabeth.

41. And it came to pass, that, when Elisabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the babe leaped^b in her womb, and Elisabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost.

42. And she spake out with a loud voice, and said, 'Blessed art thou among women, and blessed^c is the fruit of thy womb.

43. And whence is this to me, that the mother^d of my Lord should come to me?

44. For lo, as soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in mine ears, the babe leaped in my womb for joy.

45. And blessed^e is she that^f believed: for there shall be a performance^g of those things, which were told her from the Lord.'

46. And Mary^h said, 'My soul doth magnify the Lord;

47. And my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour:

48. For he hath regarded the low estate of his hand-maiden: for behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed.

49. For he that is mightyⁱ, hath done to me great things, and holy is his name:

^b Greek ἐσκήρτησεν: the same to some with ἀσμαρίζω; which with physicians importeth the child's 'stirring in the womb,' as every live child doth, more or less; but this is a word of a higher activity and motion. Plato (in Pol. 9) useth it to express the lascivious fancies of men or women in their dreams; "when that part of the soul (saith he) which is rational, gentle, and master of reason, is laid asleep,—then the other, which is bestial and brutish, being puffed up with meats and drinks, σκιρτά, leapeth, or frisketh, and, putting away sleep from it, doth seek to satisfy its own desires."

^c "The Messias shall be blessed with six blessings; viz. with the spirit of Wisdom, Understanding, Counsel, Strength, Knowledge, and Fear of the Lord;" R. Solom. on Ruth iii. 15, and the Chaldee Paraph. there.

^d Τοῦ Κυρίου μου, this here translates, not יְהוָה but אֲדֹנָי, as Psal. cx. 1.

^e Vulg. Lat. "Blessed art thou, that didst believe;" mistaking, as Jansenius conceiveth, the grammatical spirit in Αὐτῇ, and reading it, Αὐτῆ.

^f Or, 'That there shall be a performance;' for so doth the Hebrew כִּי also signify, as Job, iii. 12. כִּי אֵינִי 'That I might suck:' so Psal. xi. 3, 'The wicked bend their bow, &c. that the foundations may be destroyed, which the righteous hath made.'

^g Τελείωσις sometimes is used for setting apart to holy use, as in the LXX, Exod. xxix; and Christian writers use it sometimes for baptism and martyrdom; because they consecrate men to God. It is used of Christ, Heb. ii. 10.

^h Ludolphus, upon this place, observeth to little purpose, that the Virgin is found in Scripture, speaking but seven times.

ⁱ Ὁ Δυνατὸς, 'The mighty one,' a full and proper sense of the word Elohim, which the LXX, indeed, and the New Testament after them, have constantly expressed by Θεός, because of the mystery of the Trinity included in it. נָבַר applied to God, is Δυνατὸς in the LXX, Psal. xxiv. 8.

50. And his mercy is on them that fear him, from generation to generation^j.

51. He hath showed strength with his arm^k: he hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts^l:

52. He hath put down the mighty from their seats, and exalted them of low degree:

53. He hath filled the hungry with good things, and the rich he hath sent empty away:

54. He hath holpen^m his servant Israel, in remembranceⁿ of his mercy;

55. As he spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed for ever^o.

56. And Mary abode with her about three months, and returned to her own house."

Reason and Order.

The order of this section requireth not much confirmation; for it will plead for itself.

After the divine nature of Christ is handled, as in the section preceding,—his human is to be considered next; and so is it here: and, first, the manner of his conception; but the conception of his forerunner, John the Baptist, orderly described and declared before.

HARMONY AND EXPLANATION.

Ver. 5: "*In the days of Herod.*"

"The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, or the lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come^p."

The words are to be read discretively; *or*, rather than *and*; showing, that, when the sceptre ceased, the lawgiver succeeded; and, when both were gone, then Messiah should appear.

The sceptre continued in the hand of Judah, till the

^j Psal. ciii. 17.

^k Psal. lxxxix. 10. 13, and xcvi. 1, and cxxxvi. 12. Isa. liii. 1.

^l במחשבות לבם: Job, v. 13. 1 Cor. iii. 10. Gen xi. 8.

^m Ἀντελάβετο, used by the LXX, Isa. xli. 9, from which verse this seemeth to be taken. Ἀντίληψις, is 'an arm,' Psal. lxxxiii. 8, and 'a shield,' Psal. lxxxix. 18.

ⁿ Greek; 'To remember;' Syr. and Arab., 'And remembereth his mercy.'

^o This hath so good dependance upon several words, that it is hard to fix it. First; 'As he spake for ever, or in all ages, to our fathers.' Secondly; 'To the seed of Abraham, which shall last for ever.' Thirdly; 'He hath for ever remembered his mercy.' Fourthly; 'That mercy which is for ever.' Fifthly; 'Which is to be showed to Abraham, and to his seed for ever:' and this last, or the two last together, are most proper.

^p Gen. xlix. 10.

captivity into Babylon, and then it departed; and, being once fallen, it was never recovered, till He came, to whom it belonged. This Jeremiah^p told expressly, even at the very time, when it was in failing; “Write Coniah childless; for no man of his seed shall prosper, sitting upon the throne of David, and ruling any more in Judah.” And so did Ezekiel^q, even just then, when Nebuchadnezzar was setting himself to fetch it away; “Remove the diadem, and take off the crown, &c. I will overturn, overturn, overturn it; and it shall be no more, until he come, whose right it is; and I will give it him.”

After their return out of that captivity, the lawgiver, or the high court of the seventy elders, sat at the helm and ruled the state, till the usurpation of the Asmonean or Maccabean family distempered all. Their ambition brought in a crown; and that, civil wars; and those, the Romans; who subdued the nation, and set Herod king over them. He was the son of Antipater, of the race of Edom, or of the seed of Esau; a generation that had been an enemy to the Jews continually, but never ruled over them till now: so that now were fulfilled the words of Isaac^r to his son Esau, “Thou shalt serve thy brother Jacob; but it shall come to pass, when thou shalt have the dominion, thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck.”

Herod was bloody, like the root of which he came, which persecuted his brother, even in the womb; and, among other his cruelties, which were very horrible, and very many, he slew the Sanhedrim, or the bench of the seventy judges. And then was the lawgiver departed from between Judah’s feet, as the sceptre was out his hand long before: and then might the Jews cry out, as it is recorded they did, though upon another occasion, “Woe unto us, for the sceptre is departed from Judah, and the lawgiver from between his feet; and yet is not the son of David come.”

“There was a certain priest, named Zacharias.”

Of this name, there had been a famous priest, and a famous prophet, in old time before; Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada, before the captivity^s; and Zechariah, the son of Berechiah after^t. And consonant it was, that he, in whom

^p Jer. xxii. 30.

^q Ezek. xxi. 27, &c.

^r Gen. xxvii. 40.

^s 2 Chron. xxiv.

^t Zech. i. 1.

priesthood and prophecy should be struck dumb, and even at their period, because the great Priest and Prophet was so near at hand,—should bear the same name with them, in whom priesthood and prophecy had, in some manner, ceased before.

“Of the course of Abia^u.”

The priests were divided by David into four-and-twenty courses^x; not but that there had been courses before of them, but because there had not been so many. For, reason itself will tell us, that, since they were all bound to the sanctuary, and, withal, were so very many in number,—they could not serve there mixedly and confusedly, but must need have some distinction and order: some of the Jews say, they were divided into eight courses by Moses, four of Eleazar, and four of Ithamar; but, for this, they have no ground to show at all. Others, that they were divided into sixteen by him; namely, eight and eight of either family: and, of the division itself, there seemeth to be some probability in the text, but not of the divider. For, speaking of David's distinguishing them, because they were grown more numerous, it saith^y,—

בֵּית-אֶבְיָה אֶחָד לְאֶלְעָזָר וְאֶחָד לְאַיְתָמָר which importeth thus much,—that ‘there was one principal household added to every course of Eleazar, more than was before, and so they became sixteen; but of Ithamar were only taken those, which were used before, which were only eight; and thus did they rise to four-and-twenty.’ See R. Solomon and Dav. Kimchi, in loc.

These courses, thus newly increased by David for number, and thus newly ranked, by lot, for order, and both for the service of the temple, when it should be built,—it is but little to be doubted, but that they began their round, when the service of the temple did first begin; which round began on the sabbath, next after the feast of tabernacles, about the two-and-twentieth day of the month Tisri^z; for, on the three-and-twentieth day, Solomon dismissed all the people to their own houses^a, after he had kept the feast of tabernacles seven days before, according to the law, beginning on the fifteenth day of the month, and concluding on

^u Ἐφημερίαι, used by the LXX, 1 Chron. ix. 33, to translate לְשָׁכֶת ‘the chambers of the temple,’ if it be not miswritten.

^x 1 Chron. xxi.

^y 1 Chron. xxiv. 6.

^z 2 Chron. vii.

^a Ver. 10.

the one-and-twentieth day^b; and, the next day after, or the two-and-twentieth day, was a solemn assembly, and that year (as it may be conceived) the sabbath-day. Now, in the week of the feast, so great was the company of the congregation, and so many the multitude of the sacrifices, that no single course was able to undergo the service; but then (as also at the other two great festivals), all the courses served indifferently (and so had they done at the temple's dedication^c); and, on the next sabbath, the course of Jehoiarib, or the first, began.

They changed every week, coming in on the sabbath, and on the next going out^d; so that, by the time of the Passover, they were just gone about; and from thence, they began their second round again. In the eighth course of which second round (for so was the course of Abia^e), Zacharias heareth the glad tidings of the birth of Christ's forerunner; just about the same time of the year that Sarah^f did of the fixed time of the birth of Isaac, towards the middle of the summer.

But, that the reader may have a full and perfect view of the revolution of these courses,—and, because he will have frequent occasion, in his reading of the evangelists, to have his eye upon the passing of the year of the Jews,—let it not be tedious to interpose a calendar, or almanack, of it, here, at the very entrance; with an account of the courses of the priests, used every week at the temple,—the lessons, out of the law and the prophets, used every sabbath in the synagogues,—and their festivals, great and lesser, as they lighted in their seasons; that, whensoever hereafter, in his progress in this sacred history of the gospel, he shall have occasion to look after any of these, they may be here ready before his eyes.

The Jews reckoned their year by the lunar months, as is more than apparent by the words that signified a month amongst them, as *חֹדֶשׁ* and *יָרֵחַ* and by several stories in the Scripture; and in this their reckoning (saith Rabbi Solomon^g), “one month was full, and another wanting;” that is, one consisting of thirty days, and another only of nine-and-twenty. This computation made their years to fall eleven days short of the year of the sun: and this the Holy Ghost

^b Lev. xxiii.^c 2 Chron. v. 11.^d 2 Kings, xi. 7. 2 Chron. xxiii. 4.^e 1 Chron. xxiv. 10.^f Gen. xviii.^g On Gen. vii.

seemeth to hint and to hit upon, when, in reckoning the time of Noah's being in his ark, he bringeth him in on the seventeenth day of the second month^h, and bringeth him out on the seven-and-twentieth day of the same month, on the next yearⁱ; and yet intendeth him there but an exact and complete year of the sun, but reckoned only by lunary months.

Now, these eleven days, which the year of the sun outstretched the year of the moon, on every third year made up a month of three-and-thirty days, which the Jews laid after the month Adar, or the last month; and called it 'Veadar,' or 'Adar over again.'

But, not to insist upon any curious inquiry into their embolism, or intercalation; nor how the twelve stewards of Solomon, and the four-and-twenty courses of the priests, made out their service, those in the court, and these in the temple, on that additional month of the leap-year,—which is not a discourse for the present purpose: we will take up the year in its common and ordinary course and circle; and suppose *A* the dominical, or sabbath-day letter; and trace the courses of the priests, and the lessons of the law and prophets, according thereunto.

Now, these lessons of the law and prophets began their round, one sabbath before the courses of the priests; the first 'parashah,' or section of Genesis, being read at the feast of tabernacles. And, by the next feast of tabernacles, or the next year, all the law was read over, be the year leap-year, or no: for, if it were the ordinary year, the sections in the latter end of Deuteronomy were made fewer and longer; but, if the intercalary, or bissextile, then were they broke into more, according to the number of the sabbaths of that year; that, by the feast of tabernacles, Deuteronomy might be finished, and Genesis might be begun on again.

Whether these lessons, or sections of the law, were appointed and set out by Moses, or by Ezra, or by some other; and how the like in the prophets came to be paralleled with them, or to be read instead of them, when the persecution of Antiochus forbade the reading of the law,—is not a time and place to dispute here: only, if the reader shall observe the harmony between the two portions that were read at one time, he will see that the choice of them was of more than

^h Gen. vii. 11.

ⁱ Gen. viii. 14.

ordinary and common discretion. And sometimes the taking notice of the portions themselves, will help to clear and satisfy some obscurities, which, otherwise, it were not possible to clear and satisfy ; as some examples will be given in their places.

THE FIRST MONTH, TISRI, OR ETHANIM.

1 KINGS, VIII. 2. 2 CHRON. V. 3.

From the Middle of our September, to the Middle of October.

- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| 1 | A | Delaiah: the three-and-twentieth course. Feast of |
| 2 | B | Trumpets. |
| 3 | C | <i>Lessons.</i> |
| 4 | D | Deut. xxvi. 1, to xxix. 10. |
| 5 | E | Isa. lx. 1, to the end of the chapter. |
| 6 | F | |
| 7 | G | |
| 8 | A | Maaziah: the four-and-twentieth course. |
| 9 | B | <i>Lessons.</i> |
| 10 | C | Deut. xxix. 10, to xxxi. 1, when there were more weeks |
| 11 | D | in the years; otherwise, to the end of the book. |
| 12 | E | Isa. lxi. 10, to lxiii. 10: the tenth day of this month, |
| 13 | F | was the solemn and mysterious Feast of Expiation, |
| 14 | G | Lev. xvi. 29. |
| 15 | A | The Feast of Tabernacles: all the priests are present |
| 16 | B | and serve. The law is begun to be read. |
| 17 | C | <i>Lessons.</i> |
| 18 | D | Gen. i. 1, to vi. 9. |
| 19 | E | Isa. xlii. 5, to xliii. 11. |
| 20 | F | |
| 21 | G | |
| 22 | A | Jehoiarib: the first course beginneth. |
| 23 | B | <i>Lessons.</i> |
| 24 | C | Gen. vi. 9, to xii. 1. |
| 25 | D | Isa. liv. 1, to lv. 5. |
| 26 | E | |
| 27 | F | |
| 28 | G | |
| 29 | A | Jedaiah: the second course beginneth. |
| 30 | B | <i>Lessons.</i> |
| | | Gen. xii. 1, to xviii. 1. |
| | | Isa. xl. 27, to xli. 17. |

THE SECOND MONTH, MARCHESVAN.

Part of October, and Part of November.

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| 1 | C | |
| 2 | D | |
| 3 | E | |
| 4 | F | |
| 5 | G | |
| 6 | A | Harim: the third course beginneth. |
| 7 | B | <i>Lessons.</i> |
| 8 | C | Gen. xviii. 1, to xxiii. 1. |
| 9 | D | 2 Kings, iv, from the beginning of the chapter to |
| 10 | E | ver. 38. |
| 11 | F | |
| 12 | G | |
| 13 | A | Seorim: the fourth course beginneth. |
| 14 | B | <i>Lessons.</i> |
| 15 | C | Gen. xxiii. 1, to xxv. 19. |
| 16 | D | 1 Kings, i. 1—32. |
| 17 | E | |
| 18 | F | |
| 19 | G | |
| 20 | A | Malcaiah: the fifth course beginneth. |
| 21 | B | <i>Lessons.</i> |
| 22 | C | Gen. xxv. 19, to xxviii. 10. |
| 23 | D | Mal. i, from the beginning, to ii. 8. |
| 24 | E | |
| 25 | F | |
| 26 | G | |
| 27 | A | Mijanim: the sixth course beginneth. |
| 28 | B | <i>Lessons.</i> |
| 29 | C | Gen. xxviii. 10, to xxxii. 3. |
| | | Hos. xi, from ver. 7, to xiv. 2. |

THE THIRD MONTH, CHISLEU.

Part of November, and Part of December.

1	D	
2	E	
3	F	
4	G	
5	A	Hakkoz: the seventh course begins.
6	B	<i>Lessons.</i>
7	C	Gen. xxxii. 3, to xxxvii. 1.
8	D	Obadiah, all the chapter; or, Hos. xii. 12, to the end
9	E	of the book.
10	F	
11	G	
12	A	Abijah, or Abia: the eighth course beginneth.
13	B	<i>Lessons.</i>
14	C	Gen. xxxvii. 1, to xli. 1.
15	D	Amos, ii. 6, to iii. 9.
16	E	
17	F	
18	G	
19	A	Jeshuah: the ninth course beginneth.
20	B	<i>Lessons.</i>
21	C	Gen. xli. 1, to xlv. 18.
22	D	1 Kings, iii. 15, to the end of the chapter.
23	E	Feast of Dedication eight days.
24	F	1 Mac. iv. 59.
25	G	John, x. 22.
26	A	Shechaniah: the tenth course beginneth.
27	B	<i>Lessons.</i>
28	C	Gen. xlv. 18, to xlvii. 27.
29	D	Ezek. xxxvii. 15, to the end of the chapter.
30	E	

THE FOURTH MONTH, TEBETH.

ESTH. II. 16.

Part of December, and Part of January.

1	F	
2	G	
3	A	Eliashib: the eleventh course beginneth.
4	B	<i>Lessons.</i>
5	C	Gen. xlvii, from ver. 27 to the end of the book.
6	D	1 Kings, ii. 1—13.
7	E	
8	F	
9	G	
10	A	Jakim: the twelfth course beginneth.
11	B	<i>Lessons.</i>
12	C	Exod. i, from beginning, to vi. 2.
13	D	Isa. xxvii, from ver. 6, to xxviii. 14; or,
14	E	Jer. i. 1, to ii. 4.
15	F	
16	G	
17	A	Huppah: the thirteenth course beginneth.
18	B	<i>Lessons.</i>
19	C	Exod. vi. 2, to x. 1.
20	D	Ezek. xxviii. from ver. 25, to the end of chap. xxix.
21	E	
22	F	
23	G	
24	A	Jeshebeah: the fourteenth course beginneth.
25	B	<i>Lessons.</i>
26	C	Exod. x. 1, to xiii. 17.
27	D	Jer. xlvi, from ver. 13 to the end of the chapter.
28	E	
29	F	

THE FIFTH MONTH, SHEBAT.

ZECH. I. 7.

Part of January, and Part of February.

1	G				
2	A	Bilgah: the fifteenth course beginneth.			
3	B	<i>Lessons.</i>			
4	C	Exod. xiii. 17, to xviii. 1.			
5	D	Judg. iv. 4, to vi. 1.			
6	E				
7	F				
8	G				
9	A	Immer: the sixteenth course beginneth.			
10	B	<i>Lessons.</i>			
11	C	Exod. xviii. 1, to xxi. 1.			
12	D	Isa. vi, all the chapter.			
13	E				
14	F				
15	G				
16	A	Hezir: the seventeenth course beginneth.			
17	B	<i>Lessons.</i>			
18	C	Exod. xxi. 1, to xxv. 1.			
19	D	Jer. xxxiv. 8, to the end of the chapter.			
20	E				
21	F				
22	G				
23	A	Happitsets, or Aphses: the eighteenth course be-			
24	B	ginneeth.			
25	C	<i>Lessons.</i>			
26	D	Exod. xxv. 1, to xxvii. 20.			
27	E	1 Kings, v. 12, to vi. 14.			
28	F				
29	G				
30	A	Pethahiah: the nineteenth course beginneth.			
		<i>Lessons.</i>			
		Exod. xxvii. 20, to xxx. 11.			
		Ezek. xliii. 10, to the end of the chapter.			

THE SIXTH MONTH, ADAR.

EZRA, VI. 15.

Part of February, and Part of March.

1	B		
2	C		
3	D		
4	E		
5	F		
6	G		
7	A	Jehezekel: the twentieth course beginneth.	
8	B	<i>Lessons.</i>	
9	C	Exod. xxx. 11, to xxxv. 1.	
10	D	1 Kings, xviii. 1—39.	
11	E		
12	F		
13	G		
14	A	Jachin: the one-and-twentieth course beginneth.	
15	B	<i>Lessons.</i>	
16	C	Exod. xxxv. 1, to xxxviii. 21.	
17	D	1 Kings, vii. 13—26.	
18	E	The fourteenth and fifteenth days of this month,	
19	F	were the Feast of Purim.	
20	G		
21	A	Gamul: the two-and-twentieth course beginneth.	
22	B	<i>Lessons.</i>	
23	C	Exod. xxxviii. 21, to the end of the book.	
24	D	1 Kings, vii. 50, to viii. 21.	
25	E		
26	F		
27	G		
28	A	Delaiah: the three-and-twentieth course beginneth.	
29	B	<i>Lessons.</i>	
		Lev. i. 1, to vi. 1.	
		Isa. xliii. 21, to xliv. 24.	

THE FIRST MONTH, STYLO Novo, ABIB, Exod. xii; or
NISAN, Neh. ii. 1.

Part of March, and Part of April.

1	C		
2	D		
3	E		
4	F		
5	G		
6	A	Maaziah: the four-and-twentieth course beginneth.	
7	B	<i>Lessons.</i>	
8	C	Lev. vi. 1, to ix. 1.	
9	D	Jer. vii. 21, to viii. 4.	
10	E		
11	F		
12	G		
13	A	The Preparation.	
14	B	The Passover-day, Exod. xii. This week there was	
15	C	no distinct course that served, but all the courses	
16	D	indifferently and together.	
17	E	<i>Lessons.</i>	
18	F	Lev. ix. 1, to xii. 1.	
19	G	2 Sam. vi. 1, to vii. 17.	
20	A	Jehoiarib: the first course beginneth the round	
21	B	again.	
22	C	<i>Lessons.</i>	
23	D	Lev. xii. 1, to xiv. 1.	
24	E	2 Kings, iv. 42, to v. 20.	
25	F		
26	G		
27	A	Jedaiah: the second course.	
28	B	<i>Lessons.</i>	
29	C	Lev. xiv. 1, to xvi. 1.	
30	D	2 Kings, vii. 3, to the end of the chapter.	

THE SECOND MONTH, STYLO NOVO, JYAR.

Part of April, and Part of May.

1	E			
2	F			
3	G			
4	A	Harim: the third course.		
5	B	<i>Lessons.</i>		
6	C	Lev. xvi. 1, to xix. 1.		
7	D	Ezek. xxii. 1—17.		
8	E			
9	F			
10	G			
11	A	Seorim: the fourth course.		
12	B	<i>Lessons.</i>		
13	C	Lev. xix. 1, to xxi. 1.		
14	D	Amos, ix. 7, to the end of the book; or,		
15	E	Ezek. xx. 2—21.		
16	F			
17	G			
18	A	Malcaiah: the fifth course.		
19	B	<i>Lessons.</i>		
20	C	Lev. xxi. 1, to xxv. 1.		
21	D	Ezek. xliv. 15, to the end.		
22	E			
23	F			
24	G			
25	A	Mijamim: the sixth course.		
26	B	<i>Lessons.</i>		
27	C	Lev. xxv. 1, to xxvi. 3.		
28	D	Jer. xxxii. 6—28.		
29	E			

THE THIRD MONTH, STYLO NOVO, SIVAN.

ESTH. VIII. 9.

Part of May, and Part of June.

1	F		
2	G		
3	A	No single course, because of Pentecost-week: but	
4	B	all served indifferently.	
5	C	<i>Lessons.</i>	
6	D	Levit. xxvi. 3, to the end of the book.	
7	E	Jer. xvi. 19, to xvii. 15.	
8	F		
9	G		
10	A	Hakkoz: the seventh course.	
11	B	<i>Lessons.</i>	
12	C	Num. i. 1, to iv. 21.	
13	D	Hos. i, 10, to ii. 21.	
14	E		
15	F		
16	G		
17	A	Abijah or Abia: the eighth course.	
18	B	Now it was, that Zacharias had the tidings of the	
19	C	birth of John the Baptist.	
20	D	<i>Lessons.</i>	
21	E	Num. iv. 21, to viii. 1.	
22	F	Judg. xiii. 2, to the end of the chapter.	
23	G		
24	A	Jeshuah: the ninth course.	
25	B	<i>Lessons.</i>	
26	C	Num. viii. 1, to xiii. 1.	
27	D	Zech. ii. 10, to iv. 8.	
28	E		
29	F		
30	G		

THE FOURTH MONTH, STYLO NOVO, THAMMUZ.

Part of June, and Part of July.

1	A	Shechaniah : the tenth course.	
2	B	<i>Lessons.</i>	
3	C	Num. xiii. 1, to xvi. 1.	
4	D	Josh. ii, all the chapter.	
5	E		
6	F		
7	G		
8	A	Eliashib : the eleventh course.	
9	B	<i>Lessons.</i>	
10	C	Num. xvi. 1, to xix. 1.	
11	D	1 Sam. xi. 14, to xii. 23.	
12	E		
13	F		
14	G		
15	A	Jakim : the twelfth course.	
16	B	<i>Lessons.</i>	
17	C	Num. xix. 1, to xxii. 2.	
18	D	Judg. xi. 1—34.	
19	E		
20	F		
21	G		
22	A	Huppah : the thirteenth course.	
23	B	<i>Lessons.</i>	
24	C	Num. xxii. 2, to xxv. 10.	
25	D	Micah, v. 7, to vi. 9.	
26	E		
27	F		
28	G		
29	A	Jeshebeah : the fourteenth course.	
		<i>Lessons.</i>	
		Num. xxv. 10, to xxx. 2.	
		1 Kings, xviii. 46, to the end of chap. xx.	

THE FIFTH MONTH, STYLO NOVO, AB.

Part of July, and Part of August.

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| 1 | B | |
| 2 | C | |
| 3 | D | |
| 4 | E | |
| 5 | F | |
| 6 | G | |
| 7 | A | Bilgal : The fifteenth course. |
| 8 | B | <i>Lessons.</i> |
| 9 | C | Num. xxx. 2, to xxxiii. 1. |
| 10 | D | תשעה באב the fast of the fifth month, Zech. vii. 5. |
| 11 | E | Jer. i, from the beginning, to ii. 4. |
| 12 | F | |
| 13 | G | |
| 14 | A | Immer : the sixteenth course. |
| 15 | B | <i>Lessons.</i> |
| 16 | C | Num. xxxiii. 1, to the end of the book. |
| 17 | D | Jer. ii. 4—29. |
| 18 | E | |
| 19 | F | |
| 20 | G | |
| 21 | A | Hezir : the seventeenth course. |
| 22 | B | <i>Lessons.</i> |
| 23 | C | Deut. i. 1, to iii. 23. |
| 24 | D | Isa. i. 1—28. |
| 25 | E | |
| 26 | F | |
| 27 | G | |
| 28 | A | Happitsets, or Aphses : the eighteenth course. |
| 29 | B | <i>Lessons.</i> |
| | C | Deut. iii, from ver. 23, to vii. 12. |
| | | Isa. xl. 1—27. |

THE SIXTH MONTH, STYLO NOVO, ELUL.

Part of August, and Part of September.

1	D		1
2	E		2
3	F		3
4	G		4
5	A	Pethahiah: the nineteenth course.	5
6	B	<i>Lessons.</i>	6
7	C	Deut. vii. 12, to xi. 26.	7
8	D	Isa. xlix, from ver. 14, to li. 4.	8
9	E		9
10	F		10
11	G		11
12	A	Jehezekel: the twentieth course.	12
13	B	<i>Lessons.</i>	13
14	C	Deut. xi. 26, to xvi. 18.	14
15	D	Isa. liv, from ver. 11, to lv. 4.	15
16	E		16
17	F		17
18	G		18
19	A	Jachin: the one-and-twentieth course.	19
20	B	<i>Lessons.</i>	20
21	C	Deut. xvi. 18, to xxi. 10.	21
22	D	Isa. li. 12, to lii. 13.	22
23	E		23
24	F		24
25	G		25
26	A	Gamul: the two-and-twentieth course.	26
27	B	<i>Lessons.</i>	27
28	C	Deut. xxi. 10, to xxvi. 1.	28
29	D	Isa. liv. 1—11.	29

Thus, or not far from this form, went the Jewish year, and the courses of the priests in it: and thus the lections of the law and prophets, along with both: and hence may be collected, in some reasonable measure, the time of the year when John Baptist was born; which hath been so long not a little mistaken.

Ver. 6: “*Walking in all the commandments and ordinances.*”

In all the commandments of the moral law, and ordinances of the ceremonial: and the word *blameless*^a, expresseth their behaviour in the judicial: and thus the text sheweth us a man, as accomplished for the righteousness according to the law, as a man could be; and yet, that we might see, that a man is not justified by that, but by faith,—the same man is presently after checked, and struck dumb, because he did not believe.

§ “*Ordinances.*”

Greek, *Δικαιώματα*: which the Romanists translate, ‘justifications:’ and of the word, would make no small advantage.

Whereas, first, the LXX most commonly translate the Hebrew word *חֻקִּים* and *חֻקֹּת* by it, as above twenty times, in Psal. cxix: and this Hebrew word, we know, signifieth no such thing as ‘justifications.’ Rab. Solomon, on Num. xix, giveth a notation of it, unto another sense: “Because (saith he) Satan, and the people of the world, would be questioning with Israel, what is this or that commandment, and what reason is there in it? Why? It is *חֻקָּה*, a statute, or an ordinance, decreed by God; and it is not for thee to question it.” See also Rab. Menahem, on the same place; and to what sense the Chaldee renders it in Psal. cxix, and elsewhere.

Secondly; The common Greek useth it, most commonly, in the sense of our translation: as might be showed out of Aristotle, Ethic. 5; Dion Cassius, Rom. Hist. lib. 58, and 61; and other authors.

Thirdly; As the LXX render *חֻקִּים* or *חֻקֹּת*, by this Greek word; so the Arabic doth this Greek word by that again:

^a *Ἀμεμπτοι* used by the LXX for *תָּמִים* Gen. vii. 1, and for *יָשָׁר* Job, i. 1.—In Leusden’s Van der Hooght’s Bible, *righteous* is expressed not by *תָּמִים* but by *צַדִּיק*.—ED.

making them to sound to one and the same sense, and that דקלים importeth ‘ordinances,’ none can deny.

Fourthly; It will be very hard to produce any heathen author, or, any place in all the LXX, that uses the word $\Deltaικαίωμα$ for ‘justification.’ In Deut. xxiv. 13, a place as likely to have found it in as any,—if they would have taken it in that sense,—they have so far refused it, that they use a word, no kin at all unto it.

Ver. 9: “*According to the custom.*”

This may be taken two ways,—either for the custom of burning incense; or for that, that these courses used, in choosing out of their company to burn it, which was by lot; and this latter is more proper: for it needeth not to tell, that it was the custom of the priests to burn incense; for this was known well enough from the law, to be an essential part of their function; but the text would tell us, how Zacharias came to do this piece of service; namely, by the customary lot. So that by ‘the custom of the priesthood,’ is properly meant ‘the custom of the priests.’ “The high-priest burnt incense, when he would; the other priests, by lot: and one and the same priest, burnt not incense twice in all his days^b.”

§ “*His lot was to burn incense.*”

Sense and reason doth more bind us to understand casting of lots for this purpose, than the grammatical construction, or literal strictness, of the word; for though it signify, ‘obtaining a thing *by lot*,’ yet, not always by lot only, but even by any other means; as Judas^c $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\chi\epsilon\ \tau\acute{o}\nu\ \kappa\lambda\eta\rho\omicron\nu$, “obtained the lot of his ministration.” And so Julian, in Misopogon; Anacreon, $\tau\rho\upsilon\phi\tilde{\alpha}\nu\ \epsilon\lambda\alpha\chi\epsilon\nu\ \epsilon\kappa\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omega\nu$, “sortitus est ludere, vel deliciari,” &c. But undeniable reason telleth, that it must, of necessity, be understood of ‘obtaining by lot,’ in this place.

For the priests, in every one of the twenty-four courses, were exceeding many. For Josephus relateth, that they were thousands in every course. And this are we sure of, from evident Scripture; that, at the crowning of Joash, when an insurrection by Athaliah was feared, the priests of two courses only are reputed as a guard sufficient for the king, and about the temple^d. And when Uzziah would have

^b Abarban. in Pentateuch, fol. 241.

^c Acts, i. 17.

^d 2 Kings, xi. 5—7.

burned incense, there were eighty priests ready to withhold him^e. So that among so great a multitude, there being but one man only permitted to burn incense, it was necessary that he should be chosen from among them by lot; and the lot, at this time, fell to Zacharias.

“To burn incense, entering into the temple of the Lord.”

This his entering into the temple, was not going into the most holy place; nor was this his burning of incense, upon the day of expiation; but it was according to the daily service of the temple, which required that incense should be burned, every morning and evening, in the holy place, without the vail^f. The high-priest, indeed, once every year, offered incense within the vail, on the day of expiation^g; but, neither was Zacharias high-priest, nor was this any such service. For, first, Luke, when he speaketh of the high-priest, useth to call him by that title^h; but, in all this large story of Zacharias, he never termeth him other than an ordinary priest. Secondly; Zacharias was one of the twenty-four courses: but the high-priest was of no course at all; and, if he had, doubtless he had been of the first: but Zacharias was of the eighth. Thirdly; Zacharias, at this time, came to burn incense by lot: but the high-priest came to do it in the most holy place, by succession. Fourthly; There was no altar of incense in the most holy place; but there was one, where Zacharias ministered. Fifthly; If these courses began their round, either with the beginning of the service of the temple, or with the beginning of the year ecclesiastical, or with the beginning of the year civil, or from any of the three festivals,—then was it not possible, that the eighth course should light any whit nearer the feast of expiation: and where to begin them, but from some of these, who can imagine? Sixthly; It was not so very consonant, that John the Baptist should be born a high-priest, which bare the fullest resemblance of the office of our Saviour: but a priest of an inferior rank, because a servant to the high. The misconstruction of Zacharias's offering of incense, gave first occasion to the general and long-continued mistake of the time of our Saviour's birth.

^e 2 Chron. xxvi. 17.

^f Exod. xxx. 6—8.

^g Lev. xvi. 29, 30.

^h As, chap. iii. 2. Acts, iv. 6, &c.

Ver. 10: “*And the whole multitude of the people.*”

There were constantly in the temple, at the hour of prayer, first, The priests of that course that then served: secondly, The Levites that served under the priests: thirdly, ‘The men of the station,’ as the Rabbins call them; that is, certain men that were to represent the whole congregation, in putting their hands upon the heads of the sacrifices: fourthly, Those whom devotion moved to leave their other employments, for that time, and to be present at the service of God. All these might amount to a great number indeed; but the text, in naming ‘the whole multitude of people,’ seemeth to have some farther meaning; as if it would intimate, that this was not upon an ordinary day of the week, but upon the sabbath-day, when the congregation was full,—not only of the priests of the seventh course, that went that day out of their service;—but also of all the multitude of the city, which were tied, that day, in a more special manner, to the public worship.

Upon this day [if we might conclude it to be a sabbath], the portions of the law and the prophets, which were read in the synagogues, were excellently agreeable to the thing that was now in hand;—namely, the law of the Nazarites, Num. vi; and the conception of Samson, like this of the Baptist, Judg. xiii.

§ “*Were praying without.*”

When the burnt-offering began in the temple, the trumpeters and singers began to sound and sing, and the whole congregation to pray and worship: and all this continued until the burnt-offering was finishedⁱ; then the priest took a censer full of coals from off the altar^j [for, by the custom of that day, may be guessed the custom of the rest in this ordinary circumstance], and went into the holy place, and burnt it upon the altar^k. In the mean time, the people, in the outer court, were employed in prayer^l. “And, on the day of expiation, they were in fear, while the high-priest was within, till he came out in peace; and then there was great joy among them, because they were accepted^m.”

Ver. 11: “And there appeared an angel,” &c.] As there

ⁱ 2 Chron. xxix. 27, 28.

^l 2 Chron. xxix. 29.

^j Lev. xvi. 12.

^k Exod. xxx. 7.

^m R. Tanchum on Exod. xxxiii.

were two great mysteries to be showed in the birth of Christ, first, That God should become a man; and, secondly, That a virgin should become a mother;—so the Lord, to make way for the belief of these two, when they should be exhibited, did use two harbingers, or preparatives, as if it were of old and of long time before:—first, Apparition of angels in human shape: secondly, women's bearing children, that were old and barren. For it would be the easier believed, that the invisible God might converse visibly among men, in human flesh, when it was so ordinarily seen, that the invisible angels did so in human shapes. And it would not be so very incredible, that a virgin might bear a child, though she were not come to it by the course of nature, and though she had not known a man,—when it had been so often known, that old women had done the same, though they were past child-bearing by nature, and even past the knowledge of man. And this was the main reason, why want of children, is always, in Scripture, imputed to the defect of the women; that the miracle, appearing the more visible in them, might prepare belief the better for this.

As these two types and forerunners of those two great mysteries, were exhibited so often in the Old Testament, that they might prepare credit and entertainment for the other, when they should be exhibited in the birth of Christ; so was it most fit, that they should be declared in the birth of him, that was to be Christ's forerunner indeed; and when the mysteries they aimed at, were so near to be revealed.

“On the right side of the altar of incense.”] On the north side of it; on Zacharias's right hand, and on the right side of the house; as Ezek. x. 3: compare Zech. iii. 1; Psal. cix. 6. 31; and cxlii. 4. The appearing of an angel in the sanctuary, with a message from God, was a thing ever hardly seen or heard of before: and it sheweth how Urim and Thummim, the ordinary way of God's revealing his mind in that place, was now ceased. For God used to reveal his will to the priest by a soft voice from off the ark; but now both ark and oracle were quite gone; and the loss the lesser, when the true ark of the covenant, and the oracle of the will of God, our Saviour Christ, was so near at hand. The second temple wanted five things which were in the first, as the Jews observe, upon the want of the letter א in the word אֹכֵל, Hag. i. 8;—namely, first, The ark; secondly, Urim

and Thummin ; thirdly, The fire from heaven ; fourthly, The divine presence, or cloud of glory ; and, fifthly, The Holy Ghost, or the spirit of prophecy and power of miraclesⁿ. Yet was the glory of that house to be greater than the glory of the first, because of the presence of Christ in it.

Ver. 13 : “ Thy prayer is heard,” &c.] Not that he was now praying for a child ; for his age made him incredulous of having a child, when the angel told him of one ; and then it is not like he would pray for one ;—and in this place, and at this time, he was a person representative of the whole people ; and, therefore, was not to make a private prayer for himself : but, either the prayers, which he had before made to that purpose, were now come into remembrance ; or rather he was now praying for the delivery of Israel, the remission of their sins, and the coming of Christ, in which they without were joining with him ; and this his prayer, the angel tells him, is so ready to be answered, that his wife should presently conceive a son, that should preach remission, convert the people, and go before the face of Christ. “ And now, O ye priests, beseech God, that he will be gracious unto you^o.” And so was Zacharias, the priest, at this time doing. “ And the angel said unto him, ‘ Thy prayer is heard, and thy wife shall bear a son, and thou shalt call his name John :’ ” this name being interpreted, importeth *gracious*, as Isa. xxx. 18, 19.

Ver. 16 : “ And many of the children of Israel shall he turn.”] “ Many of Israel shall return, when they shall see signs of redemption. Whereupon, it is said, ‘ He saw that there was no man^p,’ ” &c.

Ver. 17 : “ In the power and spirit of Elias.”] John the Baptist did so nearly represent Elias, that he beareth his very name, Mal. iv ; Matt. xi. 14.

First, They both came, when religion was even perished and decaying : secondly, They both restored it, in an excellent measure ; thirdly, They were both persecuted for it,—Elias by Ahab and Jezebel,—John, by Herod and Herodias ; fourthly, They both conversed much in the wilderness ; fifthly, They agreed in austerity of life ; sixthly, In the wearing of a hairy garment, and a leathern girdle^q ; seventhly, Both of them had heaven opened to them near Jor-

ⁿ Massec. Jom. &c.

^o Mal. i. 9.

^p D. Kimchi in Isaiah, lix. 16.

^q 2 Kings, i. 8. Matt. iii. 4.

dan. To which, two parallels more might be added, if these two opinions of the Jews concerning Elias might be believed.

First, That he was of the tribe of Levi [for they take him to be Phinehas^r]; secondly, That he restored circumcision when it was decayed; from those words, “They have forsaken thy covenant^s.”

“To turn the hearts of the fathers to the children.”] That is, ‘The hearts of the Jews to the Gentiles.’

For, first, The hatred of a Jew against a Gentile, was deadly; and it was a special work of the gospel, and consequently of John, that began to preach it, to bring both these to embrace Christ,—and for, and in, him, to embrace one another.

Secondly; Experience itself confirmeth this exposition; for, as the gospel belongeth to the Gentiles as well as the Jews, and as John came for a witness, that *all* through him might believe,—so did he convert and baptize Roman soldiers as well as Jewish Pharisees.

Thirdly; Baptism, at its first institution, was the sacrament for admission of heathens only, to the church and true religion; when, therefore, the Jews also begin to desire it, and to consent to the heathens in the undertaking of it, then was the heart of the fathers turned to the children.

Fourthly; It is the common and constant use of the prophets, to style the church of the Gentiles, by the name of ‘children’ to the church of the Jews^t.

The Talmud^u, expounding these words in Malachi, seemeth to understand them of such a communion or reconciliation, as is spoken of. “Herod (saith Josephus^v) slew John the Baptist, being a good man, and enjoining the Jews, that, exercising virtue, and using right dealing one towards another, and piety towards God, they should ἐν τῷ βαπτισμῷ συνιέναι, convene or knit together in baptism.”

“And the disobedient,” &c.] In Malachi it is, “And the hearts of the children to the fathers.” But, first, The Holy Ghost is not so punctual to cite the very letter of the prophet, as to give the sense. Secondly, It was not very long after the baptizing and preaching of John, that the Jews ceased to be a church and nation; nay, even in the

^r As, see R. Lev. Gersh. on 1 Kings, xvii.

^s 1 Kings, xix. 14.

^t As, Isa. liv. 5, 6. lx. 4. 9. lxii. 5. and lxvi. 12, 13.

^u Vid. R. Sol. in loc. Malach.

^v Antiq. lib. 18. cap. 7.

time of John himself, they showed themselves enemies to the gospel, and the professors of it,—as concerning the general, or the greatest part of them : therefore, he saith not, that ‘ the heart of the children, the Gentiles, should be turned to their fathers, the Jews, which should cease to be fathers, and should cease to be a people,’ but ‘ to the wisdom of the righteous ones.’

“ The disobedient,” &c.] As in this clause he refuseth to use the term of fathers, for the reason mentioned, so doth he also of the correlative, ‘ children,’ because of his refusing that. And yet he coucheth the sense of that title under the word ‘ disobedient ;’ which word, in its most proper and natural signification, reflecteth upon untowardly children, disobedient to their parents. As, therefore, by his omitting to call the Jews ‘ fathers,’ he insinuateth their opposition against the gospel ; so, by terming the Gentiles ‘ disobedient,’ instead of ‘ children,’ he sheweth what they were before they embraced it.

“ In the wisdom of the righteous.”] For so is it in the Greek, *ἐν, in*, and not *to*. ‘ Wisdom,’ in Scripture, is often taken for ‘ religion^w ;’ and so is it to be understood here. And this wisdom is not to be held the ‘ terminus ad quem,’ or, the ‘ ultimate end,’ to which these disobedient Gentiles were to be converted ; but, ‘ in this wisdom,’ or religion, unto God. For, first, Let the two clauses of this speech be laid in antithesis, or opposition one to another [as naturally, indeed, they lie, the one aiming at the Jews as the proper subject, and the other at the Gentiles], and it appeareth plainly, that two several acts were to be performed by the Baptist, as concerning the Jews and their conversion : first, That he should turn their hearts or affections to God ;—as in the verse preceding, “ He shall turn many of the children of Israel to the Lord their God :”—and, secondly, That he should turn their hearts and affections also to the Gentiles, whom they hated before ; as here, “ He shall turn the hearts of the fathers to the children.”

Secondly ; According, therefore, to this double work of John upon the Jews, in that part of the angel’s speech, must the like duplicity be looked for in this, that concerneth the Gentiles, and to be understood, though it be not expressed. For, the angel, in this part, purposely changeth his style,

^w As, Psal. cxi. 10. Deut. iv. 6, &c.

and neither calleth the Gentiles ‘ children,’ but ‘ disobedient,’ because they were generally so before the coming of Christ;—nor the Jews ‘ fathers,’ because they ceased to be so shortly after : nor mentioneth he the Gentiles’ turning to God, but includeth it ; partly, because he had set that as the chiefest work and bent of the Baptist of all, “ to go before the Lord, and turn men to him ;” and partly, he includeth it in this phrase, “ In the wisdom of the righteous.”

Thirdly ; It is not without divine reason, that the hearts of the Gentiles are not said to be turned to the Jews, as, on the contrary, it was said of the Jews’ to the Gentiles ;—but, that they should be turned ‘ in the wisdom of the righteous ;’ for, the enmity, feud, and detestation, that was betwixt Jew and Gentile, and Gentile and Jew,—proceeded not from the same cause and original. The Jew abhorred the Gentile, not of ignorance, but of scorn and jealousy ; partly, because they stood upon their own dignity of being the people of God, which the other were not,—and partly, because they were provoked with suspicion, that the other should be the people of God, when they should not. And, therefore, when the reconciliation is to be wrought between them, it is said, that their hearts or affections should be turned to them ; for they were point blank, or diametrically, against them before. But a Gentile abhorred a Jew out of ignorance, because of his religion ; hating him as a man separate from, and contrary to, all men ; and, accounting that to be singular and senseless superstition, which was, indeed, the divine command and wisdom of God ; and not so much detesting his person for itself, as for his religion and profession. Therefore, when the Gentiles must be brought to affect and to unite to the Jews, it must be ‘ in the wisdom of the righteous,’ or, in the understanding, knowledge, and embracing of that religion, which the righteous ones professed ; which the Gentiles, till they knew and understood what it meant, accounted but vanity, singularity, and foolishness.

Ver. 18 : “ Whereby shall I know this ?”] The Jew requireth a sign^x ; and the reason of his so doing in these times, when miracles had been ceased so long a time, sheweth his doubting to be the more ; and the appearing of an angel, when such apparitions were as rare as miracles,

^x 1 Cor. i. 22.

should have made it to have been the less. For, after the death of Zechariah and Malachi and those later prophets, the Holy Ghost departed from Israel, and went up; and ceased to exhibit his familiarity among them, in vision, prophecy, and the work of miracles. So that this apparition of the angel, and this sign given to Zacharias, and wonders done in the birth of the Baptist, were as the very entrance and beginning of the restoring of those gifts, and the very dawning to that glorious day of such things, as was now to follow.

“For I am old.”] The very same was the doubt of Sarah^y. And here, first, The distrust of Zacharias doth show the more,—in that he, that was a priest, and should have instructed others,—was himself to seek in one of the first elements, and catechistical principles, of religion, concerning the almighty power and all-sufficiency of God. Secondly; The very place where the message came to him, being the place of God’s immediate oracles, and the time, being the time of his praying,—and who could have wished for a better return of his prayers?—do aggravate his unbelief.

Ver. 19: “I am Gabriel.”] It signifieth, ‘A man of God:’ being taken in the same form of construction with ‘Melchisedek.’ He breaketh out to utter his name, which angels, at other times [and, it may be, himself], had refused to do,—because he would recall Zacharias’s thoughts to the Book of Daniel, and convince his hesitation by that very Scripture, Dan. ix.

“That stand before God.”] That is, that minister to him^z. Therefore, those that, from this phrase, would collect that Gabriel is an archangel, or one of the prime order of angels,—do build but upon a very sandy foundation.

Ver. 20: “Behold, thou shalt be dumb.”] The sign given, is in Zacharias himself, and not in any thing without him; partly, because his doubting arose from the consideration of himself; and partly, that he might carry about him a punishment for his diffidence, as well as a sign for his confirmation.

Now, his punishment was twofold, ‘deafness’ and ‘dumbness’ both; for, because he had not hearkened to the angel’s speech, he was struck deaf; and, because he had

^y Gen. xviii.

^z As Dan. vii. 10. 1 Sam. xvi. 22. 2 Kings, v. 25, &c.

gainsaid it, he was made dumb. For, first, the Greek κωφός, ver. 22, and the word כרשן by which the Syrian rendereth it, do signify, both deaf and dumb. And, secondly, in ver. 62, it is said, “They made signs to him;” which had not needed, if he could have heard.

’Ανθ’ ὧν οὐκ ἐπίστευσας. This latter clause of the verse might not unfitly be rendered thus: “Thou shalt be dumb, &c. until the day that these things, *for which* thou hast not believed my words, shall be performed.” And thus is his dumbness limited or extended, the clearer, till the accomplishing of the things of which he doubted.

Ver. 22: “He could not speak to them.”] The priest, at the dismissal of the people, when the service of the temple was finished, was to pronounce the blessing in Num. vi. 24—26; which, when Zacharias is now to do, he is speechless, and cannot perform it: for the Levitical priesthood is now growing dumb, and he that was to bless indeed, namely Christ, is near at hand.

Ver. 23: “As soon as the days of his ministration were accomplished.”] The dumb and deaf priest officiateth in that service, which the lot had cast upon him, a certain time, either more or less, after he was fallen under this double imperfection.

For, first, Neither of these is named among those defects and blemishes, that secluded from the service in the sanctuary.

Secondly; The priesthood of the law consisted mainly and chiefly of manual actions, or offices for the hands; as offering, sprinkling, waving, and such others [to which sense the Targums expound ‘The works of Levi’s hands,’ Deut. xxxiii. 11], and so it might the better be speechless. But the ministry of the gospel cannot admit of dumbness, because it consisteth of preaching; and, for that purpose, was furnished and endowed at the beginning and entrance of it, with the gift of tongues.

Ver. 24: “Elisabeth hid herself, saying,” &c.] This her retiredness, and hiding herself, proceeded partly from devotion,—and partly, from respect of the child, that she had conceived. For, the words, or thoughts, that proceed from her at this her retiring, must needs show the reason why she did it. Now, she said, “Because the Lord hath done thus to me, when he looked upon me to take away my

reproach":—where two distinct things are plainly remarkable:—

First; God's taking away her reproach, by giving her a child, after so long barrenness: this is not the thing that she hideth for; but,

Secondly, His dealing *thus*^a with her, when he would take that reproach away, as to give her such a child, that was to be of so eminent a calling and so great a prophet: and for this it was, that she betook herself to this retiring and reclusiveness; partly, that she might ply her devotion so much the closer upon so great a benefit,—and chiefly, that she might sequester from all occasions of uncleanness, or defiling, since she carried one in her womb, that was to be so strict a Nazarite. As see the like, Judg. xiii. 14.

Ver. 26: "And in the sixth month."] This sixth month from the conception of the Baptist, was the tenth month of the months of the year, or the month Tebeth, which answereth to part of our December; the time at which a long error hath laid the nativity. At the very same time of the year, Esther, another virgin, had been promoted to honour and royalty, by Ahasuerus, Esth. ii. 16, 17.

"Unto a city of Galilee."] 'Out of Galilee ariseth no prophet,' the Jews said once, in the scorn of our Saviour, slanderously and very falsely^b; for out of Galilee arose the renowned prophet Jonah, of Gath-hepher^c, in the tribe of Zebulun^d: and in Galilee was much of the converse of Elias, but especially of Elisha at Shunem^e, in the tribe of Issachar^f: and all these three, famous apostles of the Gentiles. And no place could be fitter for the bringing forth of Christ, and his apostles, that were to be the converters of the Gentiles, than Galilee of the Gentiles.

"Nazareth."] See 2 Kings xvii. 9; "The tower of Nozairim:" which, if chorography would suffer, might be understood of this city, which was built, like a watch-tower, on the top of a steep hill^g. Nazareth, in the Arabic tongue, signifieth 'help;' in the Hebrew, 'a branch,' by which name our Saviour is called, Isa. xi. 1.

Ver. 27: "To a virgin."] "Rabbi Oshua, the son of Levi,

^a *Thus*, emphatical, giveth a clear resolution of this place, which hath scrupled many into strange and harsh expositions, for not observing it: as that she should hide herself for fear that she should not prove with child: others, that she did it for shame, lest she should be reputed lascivious, for being with child, &c. Judicet lector.

^b John, vii. 52.

^c 2 Kings, xiv. 25.

^d Josh. xix. 13.

^e 2 Kings, iv. 8.

^f Josh. xix. 18.

^g Luke, iv. 29.

said, Israel was comforted in a virgin; as saith Jeremiah^h, The Lord createth a new thing in the earth; a virgin shall compass a manⁱ.”

Ver. 28: “Highly favoured.”] *Κεχαριτωμένη*: this word is used by the Greek scholiast, in Psal. xviii. 26; *דַּסְתָּ עַל תַּתְחַסֵּד*: Μετὰ κεχαριτωμένου χαριτωθήσῃ; and the word from which it is derived, in Ephes. i. 6, *ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς*, &c: which let the indifferent reader view, and judge of the propriety of our English translation here, in comparison of the Vulgar Latin. The Virgin had obtained the highest earthly favour that ever mortal did, or must, do,—to be the mother of the Redeemer: and the Holy Ghost useth a singular word to express so much.

Superstition is ever too officious; but it hath showed itself more so to the Virgin Mary, than to any other. For as it hath deified her, now she is in heaven,—so hath it magnified her, in all her actions, while she was upon the earth: so that no relation, or story, that concerneth her, but it hath strained it to the utmost extremity, to wring out of it her praises, though very often to a senseless, and too often to a blasphemous, issue: as in this story of the Annunciation, there is not a word nor tittle that it thinketh, will, with all its shaping, serve for such a purpose,—but it taketh advantage to patch up her encomiums, where there is no use nor need,—nor, indeed, any truth of, and in, such a thing. This word that is under hand, *κεχαριτωμένη*, bears the bell that ringeth loudest with them to such a tune. For having translated it in their Vulgar Latin, ‘*Gratia plena*,’ or ‘full of grace;’ they hence infer, that she had all the seven gifts of the Spirit, and all the theological and moral virtues, and such a fulness of the graces of the Holy Ghost, as none ever had the like.

Whereas, 1. The use of Scripture is, when it speaketh of fulness of grace, to express it by another phrase^j. 2. The angel himself explaineth this word, in the sense of our translation, for favour received, and not for grace inherent; ver. 30, “Thou hast found favour with God.” 3. And so doth the Virgin herself also descant upon the same thing, throughout her song. 4. Joseph, her husband, suspected her for an adulteress^k; which he could never have done, if he had ever seen so infinite fulness of grace in her, as the Romanists have

^h Jer. xxxi. 21.

ⁱ Beresh. Rabb. See also Lyra and Gloss. interlin. in loc.

^j As, John, i. 14. Acts, vi. 5, &c.

^k Matt. i. 18.

spied,—and he was the likelier to have espied it of the two. 5. Compare her with other renowned women; and what difference, but only this great favour of being the mother of the Messias? They had the spirit of prophecy, as well as she:—they had the spirit of sanctification, as well as she:—and she no more immunity from sin and death, than they. 6. She was one of the number of those, that would have taken off Christ from preaching^l; and this argued not such a fulness of grace. 7. See Jansenius, one of their own side, expounding this word^m according to our reading of it.

“The Lord is with thee.”] Many understand this of the incarnation itself, or of the Lord’s being in her womb. Whereas, first, This is to take a common manner of speech, out of the common manner of interpreting it. Secondly; The Lord was not, at this very instant, come in that manner into her womb. But the words only mean, the Lord’s being with her in regard of that favour and respect, which he was about to show herⁿ. And this, among other things, showeth how senseless Popery is, in its ‘Ave Maries,’—using these words for a prayer, and, if occasion serve for it, for a charm: as, first, Turning a salutation into a prayer. Secondly; In fitting these words of an angel, that was sent, and that spake them upon a special message, to the mouth of every person, and for every occasion. Thirdly; In applying these words to her now she is in heaven, which suited with her only while she was upon earth: as, first, to say, ‘full of grace,’ to her that is full of glory: and, secondly, to say, ‘the Lord is with thee,’ to her that is with the Lord.

“Blessed art thou among women.”] Not *above*, but *among*, them^o.

Ver. 29: “And when she saw him.”] So readeth the Syrian, Arabic, and, generally, all other translations, but only the Vulgar Latin; that swerving, as it is to be suspected, wilfully, from the truth of the original, that, hereby, there might be the greater plea and colour for the Virgin’s familiarity with angels: whereas, indeed, apparition of angels, till this very occasion to Zacharias and the Virgin, was either exceeding rare, or just none at all.

“What manner of salutation,” &c.] Judge how superstition straineth the text to the Virgin Mary’s praises, when it

^l Mark, iii.

ⁿ As, Judg. vi. 12.

^m In loc.

^o See Gen. xxx. 13. Judg. v. 24.

infers from hence, that she had never been saluted by a man in all her life before:—an opinion and gloss not worth the examining.

Ver. 31: “Behold, thou shalt conceive,” &c.] From Isa. vii. 14; the angel giveth her to understand, that she is the virgin spoken of in that place: and of her apprehension of this, ariseth her question, ver. 4.

“And shalt call his name.”] This followeth the same prophecy still, and is one of the significations of the word וקראת; for it hath more than one.

For, first, It denoteth the third person feminine^p, וקראת, and so it is to be taken in that prophecy; “And *she* shall call his name Emmanuel.”

Secondly; It betokeneth also the second person, as the Chaldee, the LXX, and the other two Greek translations, render it, and the angel here; “And *thou* shalt call.”

Thirdly; It is also applied to the third person plural, as in the Greek, Matt. i. 23; and in the Chaldee, Isa. lx. 18.

“Jesus.”] The same with ‘Jehoshua’ in Hebrew^q, and ‘Joshua’ in Chaldee^r. These werē two renowned ones before:—the one whereof brought the people into Canaan, after the death of Moses; and the other brought them thither out of Babel; and so both were lively figures of our Jesus, that bringeth his people to the heavenly Canaan.

Ver. 32: “The Son of the Highest.”] From 2 Sam. vii. 14, as it is explained, Heb. i. 5, the angel now draweth the Virgin to remember that glorious promise made to David,—as the words following, concerning an eternal throne and kingdom, do evince; and, upon the rumination upon that, to reflect upon herself, and to consider that she was of the seed of David; and so he leadeth her on, by degrees, to believe and entertain, what he was relating to her.

“Shall give unto him the throne.”] Psal. ii. 7—9. Ezek. xxi. 27. Dan. vii. 14, &c.

Ver. 33: “He shall reign over the house of Jacob.”] This term, ‘the house of Jacob,’ includeth, first, All the twelve tribes, which the word ‘Israel’ could not have done. Secondly, The heathens and Gentiles also; for of such, the house and family of Jacob was full.

Ver. 34: “Seeing I know not a man.”] “These words (say the Rhemists) declare, that she had now vowed virginity

^p Deut. xxxi. 29.

^q As, Acts, vii. 45. Heb. iv. 8.

^r Ezra, ii. 2.

to God: for if she might have known a man, and so have had a child, she would never have asked, how shall this be done." And Jansenius goeth yet farther: "From these words, it doth not only follow that she hath vowed, but this seemeth also to follow from them, that her vow was approved of God^s."

Answer. First; Among the Jews, marriage was not held a thing indifferent, or at their own liberty to choose or refuse, but a binding command; and the first of the six hundred and thirteen, as it is found ranked in the Pentateuch, with the threefold Targum, at Gen. i. 23. And Paul^t seemeth to allude to that opinion of theirs, when, speaking of this subject, he saith, "Præceptum non habeo."

Secondly; Among the vows that they made to God, virginity never came in the number. Jephthah's was heedless, and might have been revoked, as the Chaldee paraphrast, and Rabbi Solomon, well conceive; and David Kimchi is of a mind, that he was punished for not redeeming it according to Lev. xxvii.

Thirdly; To die childless, was a reproach among men^u; and to live unmarried, was a shame to women: "Their virgins were not praised^v;" that is, were not married. Now, what a gulf is there between vowing perpetual virginity, and accounting it a shame, dishonour, and reproach!

Fourthly; If Mary had vowed virginity, why should she marry? Or, when she was married, why should she vow virginity? For some hold, that her vow was made before her espousals, and some after.

Fifthly; It was utterly unnecessary that she should be any such a votal,—it was enough that she was a virgin.

Sixthly; It is a most improper phrase, to say, 'I know not a man;' and to mean, 'I never must know him:' and in every place, where it is used concerning virgins, why may it not be so understood, as well as here?

Seventhly; While the Romanist goeth about with this gloss to extol her virginity, he abaseth her judgment and belief: for if she meant thus, she inferreth, that either this child must be begotten by the mixture of man, which showeth her ignorance; or that he could not be begotten without, which showeth her unbelief.

^s See also Aquin. part 3. quæst. 28. art. 4. Baron. in Apparatu ad Annal. &c.

^t 1 Cor. vii. 6.

^u Luke, i. 25.

^v Psal. lxxviii. 63.

Eighthly; She uttereth not these words in diffidence, as Zacharias had done, when he said, ‘How shall I know this;’ but in desire to be satisfied in the mystery, or the manner, as she was in the matter. She understood, that the angel spake of the birth of the Messias; she knew, that he should be born of a virgin; she perceived, that she was pointed out for that virgin; and, believing all this, she desired to be resolved, how so great a thing should come to pass.

Ver. 35: “The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee,” &c.] The angel satisfieth the Virgin’s question, with a threefold answer:—First, Instructing her in the manner of the performance: secondly, Furnishing her with an example of much like nature in her cousin Elisabeth: thirdly, Confirming her from the power of God, to which nothing is impossible. Now, whereas this unrestrained power of God was the only cause of such examples, as the childing of Elisabeth, and other barren women,—in this birth of the Virgin, something more, and of more extraordinariness, is to be looked after. In it, therefore, two actions are expressed to concur:—First, The ‘Holy Ghost’s coming’ upon the Virgin. Secondly, The ‘power of the Most High overshadowing’ her: and two fruits, or consequents, of these two actions answerable to them:—First, “The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee; therefore, that that is born of thee, shall be holy.” Secondly, “The power of the Most High shall overshadow thee; therefore, that that is born of thee, shall be called The Son of God.”

The coming of the Holy Ghost upon her, was, first, In the gift of prophecy, whereby she was both informed of the very instant when the conception was wrought,—and also more fully of the mystery of the incarnation than before.

Secondly; He did prepare and sanctify so much of her flesh, and blood, or seed, as to constitute the body of our Saviour. The work was the work of the whole Trinity, but ascribed more singularly to the Holy Ghost:—First, Because of the sanctifying of that seed, and clearing it of original taint; for sanctification is the work of the Holy Ghost. Secondly, For the avoiding of that dangerous consequence, which might have followed among men of corrupt minds, who might have opinionated, if the conception of the Messias in the womb had been ascribed to the Father, that the Son had had no other manner of generation of him.

“The power of the Most High.”] His operating power supplying the want of the vigour and embraces of the masculine parent. For to that the word ‘overshadow’ seemeth to have allusion: being a modest phrase, whereby the Hebrews expressed the embraces of the man in the act of generation,—“Spread the skirt of thy garment over thine hand-maid^w.”

“Therefore that holy thing.”] This title and epithet, first, not only showeth the purity and immaculateness of the human nature of Christ; but also, secondly, it being applied to the preceding part by way of consequence, as was touched before, it showeth that none ever was born thus immaculate, but Christ alone;—because none had ever such a way and means of conception, but only he.

Ver. 36: “Thy cousin Elisabeth hath conceived a son.”] As he had informed the Virgin of the birth of the Messias of herself, so doth he also of the birth of his forerunner, of her cousin Elisabeth. For that he intended not barely to inform her only, that her cousin had conceived a child, but that he heightens her thoughts, to think of him as Christ’s forerunner, may be supposed upon these observations:—First, That he saith, ‘a son,’ and not ‘a child.’ Secondly, That such strangely-born sons were ever of some remarkable and renowned eminency. Thirdly, That if he had purposed only to show her the possibility of her conceiving, by the example of the power of God in other women, he might have mentioned Sarah, Hannah, and others of those ancient ones, and it had been enough.

Ver. 39: “And Mary arose, &c. and went with haste into the hill-country, into a city of Juda.”] This city was Hebron. “For unto the sons of Aaron, Joshua gave the city of Arba, which is Hebron, in the hill-country of Judah^x.” And Zacharias being a son of Aaron, and dwelling in the hill-country of Judah, it were senseless to seek for his house in any other place than Hebron. This place had been excellently renowned in ancient time: Here was the promise given of Isaac; here was the institution of circumcision; here Abraham had his first land, and David his first crown; and here lay interred the three couples, Abraham and Sarah, Isaac and Rebekah, Jacob and Leah,—and, as antiquity hath held, Adam and Eve. Now there are many reasons given by

^w Ruth, iii. 9.

^x Josh. xxi. 11.

expositors, of Mary's hasting hither after the message of the angel: as, either to know the truth of what was told her about Elisabeth; or to congratulate and rejoice with her; or to minister to her in her great belliedness; or that the Baptist, in Elisabeth's womb, might be sanctified by the presence of Christ, in hers, &c.

But I cannot but conceive this to be the very reason, indeed,—that “she might there conceive the Messiah, where so many types, figures, and things, relating to him, had gone before,—namely, in Hebron.” For, 1. This suited singularly with the harmony and consent which God used in his works, that the promise should begin to take place by the conception of Messiah, even among those patriarchs, to whom the promise was first given. 2. A kind of necessity seemeth to lie upon it, that this Shiloh, of the tribe of Judah, and the seed of David, should be conceived in a city of Judah, and of David; as he was to be born in another city, that belonged to them both. 3. The evangelist's so punctually describing this city, seemeth rather to refer to Christ than John; who, being of the priests, might indifferently have been born in any of the tribes whatsoever. Only the Holy Ghost giveth us to observe this, which may not be passed,—that John, that should bring in baptism instead of circumcision, was born in that very place, where circumcision was first ordained, in the city Hebron. It is generally held, indeed, that the Virgin conceived in Nazareth, and in the very instant of the angel's talking with her; but whether there be not as much probability for this opinion, as for that, I refer to the equal and judicious reader.

Ver. 40: “And saluted Elisabeth.”] This seemeth to have been at some distance, and a wall or floor between: as consider seriously on ver. 42. 44.

Ver. 41: “The babe leaped.”] Ἐσκίρτησε: This word is used by the LXX, for Jacob's and Esau's stirring in the womb, and the leaping of the mountains at the giving of the law.

Elisabeth, in ver. 44, addeth, “The babe leaped, ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει:” not that he knew what he did when he leaped, any more than they; but that either this was the first time, or this time was extraordinary. The word ἀγαλλίασις signifieth outward gesticulation or exultation, as well as inward joy; yea, though there be no inward joy at all: as ἀγαλ-

λίαν οἱ βουνοὶ περιζώσονται, “the little hills shall be girded with exultation^z:” and so is it to be understood here: “The babe in my womb leaped with extraordinary gesticulation or exultation;” and ἐν to signify the ‘manner of the thing done,’ and not ‘the cause of the doing.’

Ver. 45: “And blessed is she that believed.”] Elisabeth, in this clause, seemeth to have an eye to her own husband’s unbelief, and the punishment that befel him for the same. He, a man, a priest, aged, learned, eminent, and the message to him of more appearing possibility: and Mary, a woman, mean, unlearned, and of a private condition, and the tidings to her most incredible, both to nature and reason,—and yet she believed, and he did not.

Ver. 48: “He hath regarded the low estate.”] Ἐπέβλεψεν is used by the LXX^a, and importeth a look of pity and compassion, and not of observation of desert, as the Papists would have it here: for some of them render this clause thus, “He hath looked on mine humility with approbation;” and others give this gloss upon it; “Because of her humility, she deserved to be exalted, and by it she was primely disposed to conceive, and bear the only-begotten Son of God.” But, 1. The word ἐπέβλεψεν, as it is said before, in the LXX, who must best help us to interpret, signifieth a look of another nature. 2. Ταπείνωσις signifieth not the virtue of humility, or lowliness of mind, but the state of a low and poor condition; and so is it rendered here by the Syrian, Arabic, Spanish, French, Diodati, Italian, Dutch, and all Latin, that are not wedded to the Vulgar: and so is it used by the LXX, Gen. xvi. 11, and xli. 52; 1 Sam. i. 11; and so again by the New Testament, Acts viii. 33; compared with the original in Isa. liii. 8. And so profane and heathen authors distinguish betwixt ταπείνωσις and ταπεινοφροσύνη:—by the former, understanding as we do here;—and, by the latter, the virtue of humility. 3. The same word in a manner, or one of the same root, in ver. 52, is opposed to δυναστὰς, and inevitably beareth the sense we follow. 4. If the Virgin spake in the sense the Romanists would have her, “He hath looked upon my lowliness to give it its desert,”—she would prove to be intolerably proud in the valuing of her humility.

“All generations shall call me blessed.”] As Gen.

^z Psal. lxxv. 13.

^a 2 Sam. ix. 8, and Psal. xxv. 16.

xxx. 13. “Not only thou, O cousin Elisabeth, and the Jewish nation, that expect the Messias,—but even all the world, and all successions of ages among the heathen, shall come to the knowledge and confession of Christ, and account me blessed in the favour that I have received.”

Ver. 51: “He hath scattered the proud,” &c.] If the Virgin aim these words, and those of the same tenor that follow, at any particular persons, as some conceive she doth,—and meaneth the devils, or the Pharisees, or the Jews,—it might as well be conceived, that she hath respect to the four tyrannous and persecuting monarchies in the Book of Daniel, which were now destroyed, as much as to any thing else. But since the very same words, in a manner, are to be found in the song of Hannah^b, they warrant us to interpret them not so restrictively, as to any one particular example,—but of the general and ordinary dealing of God in the world, with the wicked.

SECTION IV.

MATT. I.

Ver. 1. “THE book^c of the generation^d of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham.

2. Abraham begat Isaac, and Isaac begat Jacob, and Jacob begat Judas^e and his brethren,

3. And Judas begat Phares and Zara of Thamar, and Phares begat Esrom, and Esrom begat Aram,

4. And Aram^f begat Aminadab, and Aminadab begat Naasson, and Naasson begat Salmon^g,

5. And Salmon begat Booz^h of Rachab, and Booz begat Obed of Ruth, and Obed begat Jesse,

6. And Jesse begat Davidⁱ the king, and David the king begat Solomon of her *that had been the wife* of Urias,

^b 1 Sam. ii.

^c Gen. v. 1.

^d It might be understood, ‘The book of the history,’ as ‘generation’ is taken, Gen. ii. 4, and xxxvii. 2; and so it might be the title, not of this chapter only, but of the whole book. But since the evangelist’s intention is to set down Christ’s alliance to the royal line by his father Joseph, the phrase must be understood accordingly: and so the Chaldee useth the very Greek word to translate משפחה ‘the family’ of Ram. Job, xxxii. 2. See a third sense of γενεσῆως in Jam. i. 23, and iii. 6.

^e Judas for Jehudah in Hebrew: for the Greek cannot utter *h* before a vowel in the middle of a word, nor after one in the end: therefore, in the middle, it leaveth it out, as in Josaphat, Joram, and this word Judas; and in the end it changeth it in *s*; as in this, and many other words in this chapter.

^f Or Ram; 1 Chron. ii. 9. Ruth, iv. 19. ^g Called Salma, Ruth iv. 20.

^h He is held by the Jews to be Ibzan, Judg. xii. 8.

ⁱ ‘David,’ in the Arabic, signifieth ‘a worm:’ to which he may seem to allude, Psal. xxii. 6.

7. And Solomon begat Roboam, and Roboam begat Abia^j, and Abia begat Asa^k,

8. And Asa begat Josaphat, and Josaphat begat Joram, and Joram begat Ozias,

9. And Ozias begat Joatham, and Joatham begat Achaz, and Achaz begat Ezekias,

10. And Ezekias begat Manasses, and Manasses begat Amon, and Amon begat Josias,

11. And Josias begat Jechonias^l and his brethren, about the time they were carried away into Babylon :

12. And after they were brought to Babylon, Jechonias begat Salathiel, and Salathiel begat Zorobabel,

13. And Zorobabel begat Abiud, and Abiud begat Eliakim, and Eliakim begat Azor,

14. And Azor begat Sadoc, and Sadoc begat Achim, and Achim begat Eliud,

15. And Eliud begat Eleazar, and Eleazar begat Matthan, and Matthan begat Jacob,

16. And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ.

17. So all the generations from Abraham to David, are fourteen generations ; and from David until the carrying^m away into Babylon are fourteen generations ; and from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ, are fourteen generations.

18. Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise :

^j Rehoboam, in naming this his son Abijah, which signifieth, ' God is my father, seemeth to have had his eye upon the promise to David, " I will be his father," 2 Sam. vii. 14 : which because he embraced not by a lively faith, but challenged only by a presumptuous usurpation,—for he walked not in the ways of David,—therefore doth the text elsewhere conceal the name of God, in the name of his son, and calleth him *Abijam*, ' My father is a sea ;' for so inconstant in good was Rehoboam (as Jam. i. 6), being a child at forty years old, 2 Chron. xiii. 17.

^k The Arabic readeth it ' Asaph.'

^l Called Conias, Jer. xxii. 24. For God, by taking away the first syllable of his name, sheweth that he will not establish the throne or race of Solomon any more upon it : as his father Jehoiakim, belike, in so naming him, had presumed. The Jews delighted to join the name ' Jehovah,' to their own names, but somewhat shortened : for in the beginning of the name, it was but *Jeho* ; as Jeho-shaphat, Jeho-ram, &c ; and in the end, it was *Jahu* ; as Mica-jahu, Eli-jahu. And sometime in the very same name it was set before, or after, indifferently ; as Jeho-ahaz, 2 Chron. xxi. 17, is Ahaz-jahu, 2 Chron. xxii. 1. So Jehoiachin, 2 Kings xxiv. 8, is Jechou-jahu, 1 Chron. iii. 16.

^m The captivity of the Jews into Babel, was but *Μετοικεσία*, ' a flitting of their families' (as Aristeas saith of Ptol. Lagus's capturing them, *τοὺς μὲν μετακίσειν, τοὺς δὲ ἡχμαλώτευσεν*) ; for they returned, ere long, to their own home again. But the ten tribes captivated by Shalmaneser, are said to be, *ἐν Ἀποικίᾳ* in the LXX, 2 Kings, xviii. 11, in a perpetual departure from their own houses ; and they, and all the rest of the nation, are at this day *ἐν διασπορᾷ*, ' in a dispersion,' without any home of their own at all, John, vii. 35. Jam. i. 1. 1 Pet. i. 1.

When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost.

19. Then Joseph her husband being a just man, and not willingⁿ to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily.

20. But, while he thought on these things, the angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream, saying, ‘Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her, is of the Holy Ghost.

21. And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins.’

22. Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying,

23. ‘Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and shall call his name Emmanuel,’ which being interpreted is, God with us.

24. Then Joseph being raised from sleep did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, and took unto him his wife:

25. And knew her not until she had brought forth her first-born son: and he called his name JESUS.”

Reason of the Order.

After Mary hath been three months absent from Joseph [as in the last verse of the section preceding], upon her return, he perceiveth her to be with child, for which he intendeth secretly to put her away; as Tamar^o, after three months, is described to be in the same case, and Judah resolveth, publicly, to put her to death.

This being considered, it is plain to see, how properly the eighteenth verse of this chapter followeth, in order of time, after the last verse of the section next going before.

Now, since the evangelist hath begun with the ge-

ⁿ Παραδειγματίσαι. It hath been thought, saith Gellius, that there ought to be three causes in punishing of offences. The first, *Νουθεσία*, *κόλασις*, or *παράνεσις*, is, when punishment is used for castigation or amendment of him that hath offended. The second, called *τιμωρία*, is, when punishment is used, that the dignity and honour of him that hath been wronged, may be maintained. The third, which is called *παράδειγμα*, is, when punishment is inflicted for example's sake, that others, by the fear of the known punishment, may be deterred from the like offences. *Noct. Att. lib. 6. cap. 14.*

^o Gen. xxxviii. 24.

nealogy, that also must here be taken in; and that the rather, because he hath placed it in the forefront of his Gospel, for special reason. First; That he might make way for the understanding of those words of the angel, “Joseph, thou son of David^p.” Secondly; That the title, which the wise men give to our Saviour, might be cleared, when they call him “King of the Jews^q.” Thirdly; That his being the true and right Messias might be approved, by showing that, according to the promises and prophecies made before concerning him, he was descended of the seed of Abraham, and the stock of David. For the two first and main things that the Jews would inquire after concerning our Saviour, to try whether he were the true Messias, or no,—would be these; first, whether he were of the house of David; secondly, whether he were born in Beth-lehem: and so we find them questioning about him^r. In this regard, it was necessary, that Matthew, a Hebrew, writing his Gospel for the Hebrews, should, at the very first entrance of it, give them satisfaction in these two particulars: which he doth accordingly, showing his descent from David in this chapter, and his birth in Beth-lehem, in the next chapter following.

The last verse of this section and chapter, “He knew her not, till she had brought forth her first-born son,” &c. may seem to interpret the right order of the story, and to bring in Christ’s birth before its time, if we lay it here. But since the evangelist will say no more of it, but only this,—and because we desire to break the text into as few pieces as possible, this shall be let to lie where it doth, without any transposition; and we will imagine the two next sections to be expositions at large, upon what this verse doth but speak in brief.

HARMONY AND EXPLANATION.

Public registers of the tribe of Judah, and of the other tribes that adhered to it, were reserved even in the captivity and forward; as may be collected by the books of Ezra and Nehemiah: and from Luke’s telling, that Anna was of the tribe of Aser,—and Paul’s, that himself was of the tribe of Benjamin.

From one of these doth Matthew fetch the latter end of

^p Matt. i. 20.

^q Matt. ii. 2.

^r John, vii. 42.

his genealogy, and Luke from another the beginning of his, having then the civil records to avouch for them, if they should be questioned; which the Jews now wanting, do unjustly cavil.

“The son of David, the son of Abraham.”] Jesus Christ is to be applied unto both, thus: “Jesus Christ, the son of David,—Jesus Christ, the son of Abraham:”—as see the like phrase, Gen. xxxvi. 2; “Aholibamah, the daughter of Anah, the daughter of Zibeon:” that is thus to be understood, “Aholibamah the daughter of Anah, Aholibamah the daughter of Zibeon:” as that chapter maketh it most clear. And there is the like, and far more largely, Luke iii. 23, &c.

Now Abraham and David are named, rather than any other; first, because one of them was father of the Jewish nation, and the other, the first in the kingdom; of which nation and kingdom, all prophecies had told, that Christ should come:—secondly, because the promise of Christ was made to these two in plainer terms, than to any other.

David is first named; first, because the promise to him was fresher in memory, plainer, and more explicate: secondly, because the descent of the Messias from David was the main thing the Jews looked after in him: thirdly, the Holy Ghost doth hereby, as it were beforehand, answer the impious distinction, so frequent among the rabbins, of ‘Messias Ben Joseph,’ and ‘Messias Ben David.’

Ver. 2: “Judas and his brethren.”] His brethren are added, from Gen. xlix. 8, to comfort the dispersed tribes, that were not yet returned out of captivity; as Judah was in their equal interest in Christ, as well as he: as Hos. i. 11.

Ver. 3: “Phares and Zara.”] He nameth Zara, because he would bring in their mother, Tamar. Ishmael and Esau,—the one, a brother to Isaac; the other, a twin to Jacob,—are not mentioned, because they were both wicked: but the brethren of Judah, and the twin to Phares, are named, because they are both good. “At the birth of Jacob and Esau, it is said תּוֹמִים twins, with the letter נ wanting; because Esau, one of them, was evil: but, at the birth of Phares and Zara, it is said תּאֻמִּים with that letter supplied: because both of them were good^s.”

“Of Tamar.”] Four women are named in this genealogy: women, once of notorious infamy. Tamar, incestuous;

^s R. Sol. in Gen. xxv, and xxxviii.

Rahab, a harlot; Ruth, a heathen; and Bath-sheba, an adulteress: to show, that Christ came to heal all sores, when he recured such sinners; and that he despised not our shame, when he shamed not to descend of such parents.

Ver. 5: "Rahab."] It can little be doubted, but that he meaneth her, mentioned Josh. ii. Now the Jews [belike to deface the truth of Matthew, who, from ancient records, averreth her for the wife of Salmon] have broached this tenet,—that she was married unto Joshua^t.

Ver. 8: "Joram begat Ozias."] Here three^u descents are omitted, namely,—Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah; as compare 2 Chron. iii, and 2 Kings viii. But it is most divinely done, from the threatening of the second commandment, "Thou shalt not commit idolatry; for I visit the sins of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation." Joram committed idolatry, like the house of Ahab; for the daughter of Ahab was his wife; 2 Kings, viii. 18. Therefore, it is just with God to visit that sin upon his children: in sign of which he blotteth them out of this line, to the fourth generation. So is it the manner of Scripture, very often to leave men's names out of certain stories and records, to show a distaste at some evil in them. So all Cain's posterity is blotted out of the Book of the Chronicles, as it was out of the world, by the flood. So Simeon is omitted in Moses's blessing^v, for his cruelty to Shechem, and to Joseph. So Dan, at the sealing of the Lord's people^w, because of idolatry, begun in his tribe^x: and so Joab, from among David's worthies^y, because of his bloodiness to Amasa and Abner. Such another close intimation of God's displeasure of this wickedness of Joram, is to be seen, 2 Chron. xxii. 1, 2; where the reign of his son, Ahaziah, is not dated according to the custom and manner of the other kings of Judah, but by the style of the continuance of the house of Omri, into which family his father had married; and was become so profane, as to worship their idols. "The son of the two-and-forty years was Ahaziah, when he began to reign:" That is, of the last of the two-and-forty, of the house of Omri, in which it fell, and Ahaziah with it.

Ver. 11: "Josias begat Jechonias."] So readeth the Sy-

^t Vide Kimchi, in loc. ^u The seed of the wicked shall be cut off, Psal. xxxvii. 28. See the letter *y*, which is the last letter of זרע 'the seed,'—and of רשע 'the wicked,' cut out of that acrostical and alphabetical Psalm, at that very place.

^v Deut. xxxiii.

^w Rev. vii.

^x Judg. xviii.

^y 2 Sam. xxiii.

rian, Arabic, and the most and best Greek copies. And so the evangelist himself requireth that it be read, to make fourteen generations from David to the captivity into Babel. And so readeth D. Kimchi, on 1 Chron. iii. 15. Josias, indeed, begat Joachim; and Joachim begat Jechonias: but he, that was neither fit to be lamented, nor to be buried like one of the kings of Judah^z, was much more unfit to come into the line of the kings of Judah, that leadeth to Christ.

Ver. 12: “Jechonias begat Salathiel.”] Jechonias was father to Salathiel, as Baasha was to Ahab^a, not by generation, but by predecession. For Jechonias, in very deed, was childless^b; and the natural father of Salathiel was Neri^c: yet he is said to beget him, because he declared and owned him for his next heir and successor. As God is said^d to beget Christ on the day of his resurrection, that is, “declared him thereby to be his Son^e.”

The Scripture affecteth to speak short in relating of stories, that are well known before: as, to spare more, you may find an example, far harsher than this, in 1 Chron. i. 36; where Timna, the concubine of Eliphaz, is named as Eliphaz’s son. And, in 1 Chron. iii. 16, Zedekiah, the uncle of Jeconiah, is called his son, because he succeeded him in the royalty.

The Jews, in their Talmud, give this rule for a fundamental point:—“That there is no king to be for Israel, but of the house of David, and of the seed of Solomon only. And he that separateth against this family, denieth the name of the blessed God, and the words of his prophets, that are spoken in truth^f.”

With this opinion, although Matthew seem to comply, at the first appearance, in that he deriveth our Saviour from Solomon; because of the Hebrews, for whom he wrote, which looked for him from thence:—yet the carnal sense of it, which aimeth only at the earthly kingdom of the Messias, and at the exact descent from Solomon, he closely confuteth, to the eyes of the intelligent reader, by these two things: 1. In that he bringeth the line along to Jechonias, in whom the seed of Solomon, and the regal dignity also with it, failed: 2. In that he deriveth the interest of Christ

^z Jer. xxii. 18, 19.

^a 1 Kings, xx. 34.

^b Jer. xxii. 30.

^c Luke, iii. 27.

^d Psal. ii. 7. Acts, xiii. 33.

^e Rom. i. 4.

^f Sanhedr. cap. 10. and R. Samuel in Ner. Mitsyah. fol. 153.

in that dignity, if it were any, only by Joseph: which, according to the flesh, had no relation at all to him, save the marriage of his mother.

The Jews, to disgrace the Gospel of St. Luke, do hold, that Jechonias was the natural father of Salathiel; and that, upon his repentance in Babel, God gave him children, as Assir and Salathiel^e. But God had sworn^f, and he will not repent^g, that he should die childless to the throne: and his repentance could no more repeal this oath of God, than the prayer of Moses did the decree of his not entering into the land.

“And Salathiel begat Zorobabel.”]—“Salathiel begat Pedaiah, and Pedaiah begat Zorobabel^h.” But because, when the masculine line of Solomon’s house failed in Jechonias,—the dignity, turning over to the line of Nathan, first settled upon Salathiel, but first showed itself eminent in Zorobabel: therefore constantly, when mention is made of Zorobabel, he is not called the son of Pedaiah, a man of no action, but obscure,—but the son of Salathiel, in whom the honour of that family began. For “Jechonias was a signet plucked offⁱ,” and Zorobabel was set on again in his stead^k.

Ver. 13: “And Zorobabel begat Abiud.”] Among the children of Zorobabel, mentioned 1 Chron. iii. 19, 20, there is no memorial either of Abiud, his son, named here,—or of Rhesa, his son, named by St. Luke. But as, in Scripture, it is ordinary for one man to have several names, so is it to be understood of these. The eldest son, then, of Zorobabel, to whom the honour, lately fallen upon that house, was to descend, was called Mesullam; either in memorial of Solomon, the glory of whose house was transferred to him [and so he also calleth a daughter of his ‘Shelomith,’ the name by which the wife of Solomon is called^l, as being but the feminine of Shelomoh]; or, from the significancy of the word, which importeth ‘requited.’ For whereas Jechonias was also called ‘Shallum,’ that is, ‘finished,’ because the race and line of Solomon did end in him,—when a recompense of the failing of that, is made by the succession of Salathiel in its stead; well might Zorobabel, in whom it first showed, call his son ‘Meshullam,’ or *Requited*:—or from their peace-

^e D. Kimchi on 1 Chron. iii.

^f Jer. xxii. 28.

^g Psal. cx. 4.

^h 1 Chron. iii. 18, 19.

ⁱ Jer. xxii. 24.

^k Hag. ii. 23.

^l Cant. vi. 13.

able building and inhabiting Jerusalem, after their return from Babel. The son of Meshullam was called also ‘Abiud,’ in remembrance of his father’s glory. And his second brother, Hananiah, was also called ‘Rhesa,’ that is, ‘the chief,’ or principal, because of Christ’s descending from him. These things we have now but by conjecture; but that we may take the bolder, because the text, in the place alleged in the Chronicles, hath set these two sons of Zorobabel apart and distinct from the rest of their brethren, as if for some special thing more remarkable than they. But there is no doubt, but the evangelists, in naming them by these names, had warranty from known and common records to justify them in it.

Ver. 17: “Fourteen generations.”] In every one of these several fourteens, they were under a several and distinct manner of government; and the end of each fourteen produced some alteration in their state. In the first, they were under prophets: in the second, under kings: and, in the third, under Asmonean priests. The first fourteen brought their state to glory, in the kingdom of David: the second, to misery, in the captivity of Babylon: and the third, to glory again, in the kingdom of Christ.

The first begins with Abraham, that received the promise,—and ends in David, that received it again with greater clearness. The second begins with the building of the temple, and ends in the destruction of it. The third begins with their peeping out of misery, in Babel, and ends in the accomplished delivery by Christ.

The second, that terminateth in the people’s captiving into Babel, fixeth not in Jehoiakim, in whom the captivity began; nor in Zedekiah, in whom it was consummate; but in Jechonias, who was in the middle space between: and from the same date, doth Ezekiel count and reckon the captivity, through all his book^m.

The whole sum of the three fourteens, is the renowned number of ‘two-and-forty:’ the number of the knops, and flowers, and branches, of the candlestick; of the journeys and stations of Israel, betwixt Egypt and Canaanⁿ; and of the children of Beth-el^o.

Ver. 18: “Before they came together,” &c.] That is, to

^m Chap. viii. 1; xx. 1; xxvi. 1; xxix. 1; xxxi. 1; xxxii. 1; and xl. 1.

ⁿ Num. xxxiii. ^o 2 Kings, ii. 24. And see Rev. xi. 2, and xiii. 5.

dwell together in the same house. Nay, it is very probable, that, as yet, they dwelt not in the same town,—but Joseph, in Capernaum,—and Mary, in Nazareth.

Ver. 19: “To make her a public example.”] Παράδειγμα-τίζειν: a word used by the LXX, Num. xxv. 4, Ezek. xxviii. 17, &c; and by the New Testament, Heb. vi. 6; and ever, saith Erasmus, in an evil sense. Brucioli hath strangely translated this clause, “Non lo volendo publicare:” and divers of the Papists have more strangely expounded it; as “non volens traducere,” “not willing to take her to himself, or to his own house:” and why?—because he thought himself unworthy of her society; and because the brightness of her face was such, that he could not look upon it: and he thought it more possible for a woman to conceive without a man, than for Mary to sin.

And thus will they make Joseph to divorce his wife, or, at least, to use unkindly, for her too great excellences.

“To put her away^p privily,”] The law bound him not to bring her, either to shame by trial before the priests^q, or to punishment by the sentence of the judges. The adulteress, indeed, was to be put to death, if she were accused, prosecuted, and convicted; but to accuse and prosecute her, the law bound not, but upon apprehension in the very act^r. If a man took a wife, and hated her^s, he might bring her to trial, and, upon conviction, to punishment: but if he love her, for all his suspicion, and will connive at her fault, and not seek her death,—he is at liberty to connive, and tolerated by the law so to do, and blameless if he did it^t. But if a couple were deprehended in the act of adultery, then must there be no connivance:—Deut. xxii. 22, explaining Levit. xx. 10: and the case of the unbetrothed damsel, Deut. xxii. 28, explaining the case of the betrothed.

And thus is the question easily answered, which hath so toiled many expositors: how Joseph can be said to be *just*, when, in this very matter, that is now in hand, he violateth the law? it is answered, by denying that he violated the law: for that tolerated him thus to do.

^p Ἀπολῦσαι; to divorce her, as Matt. v. 31; and xix. 7. Mark, x. 4. Luke, xvi. 18.—Erasmus, ‘Voluit clanculum ab ea divertere;’ and so Brucioli, ‘La volse occultamente lasciare:’ making Joseph a patient in the divorce, rather than an agent; or rather divorcing himself, than her.

^q Num. vi.

^r John, viii. 4, 5. Deut. xxii. 22. Num. xxv. 8.

^s Deut. xxii. 13.

^t As Judg. xix. 2, 3.

Ver. 21 : “ Jesus, for he shall save.”] Rabena Haccadesh saith, “ Because Messias shall save men, he shall be called ‘ Joshua.’ But the heathen of another nation, which shall embrace the belief of him, shall call his name ‘ Jesus :’ and this is intimated, in Gen. xlix, *כי יבא שילה*, ‘ until Shiloh come^u.’”

Ver. 23 : “ Behold, a virgin.”] The Jews seek to elude this prophecy of Isaiah, by expounding it, either of the prophet’s wife^v, or of the king’s wife ; and, from Prov. xxx. 19, they plead, that *עלמה* doth not strictly signify ‘ a virgin,’ but ‘ a woman that hath known a man.’

Answer 1 ; There are three words in the Hebrew, that signify and betoken virginity, but this most properly:—First; *נערה* signifieth a virgin, but not always : for it properly denoteth, a young woman ; yea, though she be not a virgin, but hath been touched. Secondly; *בתולה* is the common word, used to denote virginity ; yet, as Galatine observeth, out of Prov. xxx, it seemeth sometime to be taken otherwise. But, thirdly, *עלמה* properly importeth, a “ young virgin,” and not at all one touched : so that *נערה* signifieth any young woman, though she be not a virgin ; *בתולה*, a virgin, though she be not young ; but *עלמה*, importeth youth and virginity both.

Secondly : The LXX, in the place of Isaiah cited, translate the word *παρθένος* : which denoteth no otherwise than a virgin.

Thirdly ; It is given for a sign to Ahaz, that “ *עלמה* should bear a son :” now for one, that had known a man, to do so, were no sign at all^w.

“ They shall call his name Emmanuel.”] ‘ Nomen naturæ,’ not ‘ impositionis ;’ they shall own him for ‘ God in our nature,’ and not denominate him Emmanuel, for his imposed name. See the like phrase, Isa. lx. 18 ; Ezek. xlviii. 35.

“ Which is, being interpreted.”] First ; This, and other passages of the same nature, in this evangelist, argue strongly, that Matthew wrote not his Gospel in the Hebrew tongue, as is very commonly held : for, first, then had this word needed no interpretation, and it had been very hard to have interpreted it, but by the same word again. Secondly ; The Jews in those times, that Matthew wrote, understood not the Hebrew tongue in its purity, but had degenerated into

^u Vid. Galatin. lib. 3. cap. 20.

^v Isa. viii. 3.

^w See Galatin. lib. 7. cap. 15.

the use and speech of the Syrian. Thirdly; Jonathan Ben Uzziel translated the prophets out of Hebrew into Chaldee, a little before the coming of Christ; and Onkelos did as much by the law, a little after; and both did so, because the Jews could not, at that time, understand or read the Bible in its own Hebrew tongue: and how improper, then, was it, for Matthew to write his Gospel in that language! Fourthly; All the world, that used the Old Testament at those times,—unless it were such as had gained the Hebrew tongue by study,—used it in the translation of the LXX, or the Greek; and it was requisite, that the penmen of the New Testament should write in that language, and according to their style [as Paul writing for, and to, Romans,—and Matthew and he to Hebrews], that their quotations, out of the Old Testament, might be examined by the Greek Bible. Fifthly; Let those, that hold the opinion we are confuting, but seriously consider, that Christ calleth himself by the name of two Greek letters, and why:—Rev. i. 8.

Ver. 25: “He knew her not, till she had brought forth.”] This properly falleth in order at Luke ii. 7, and there shall it be taken up again.

SECTION V.

The Birth and Circumcision of John the Baptist, and the Tongue of his Father restored, &c.

LUKE, I.

Ver. 57. “Now Elisabeth’s full time^x came, that she should be delivered; and she brought forth a son.

58. And her neighbours^y, and her cousins heard, how the Lord had showed great mercy^z upon her; and they rejoiced with her.

59. And it came to pass, on the eighth day, they came to circumcise the child; and they called him Zacharias, after the name of his father.

60. And his mother answered and said, ‘Not so; but he shall be called John.’

^x Though she conceived her child above the course of nature, yet his time in the womb was according to it.

^y Hebron was inhabited by Aaronites: but the fields and villages about, with children of Judah, Josh. xxi. 11. These two are Elisabeth’s neighbours and cousins.

^z Greek, ‘had magnified mercy:’ הגדיל חסדו as in Psal. xviii. 51, the Hebrew and LXX, and Psal. cxxvi. 2.

61. And they said unto her, ‘There is none of thy kindred, that is called by this name.’

62. And they made signs to his father, how he would have him called.

63. And he asked for a writing-table^a, and wrote, saying, ‘His name is John;’ and they marvelled all.

64. And his mouth was opened^b immediately, and his tongue loosed, and he spake, and praised God.

65. And fear came on all that dwelt round about them; and all these sayings were noised abroad throughout all the hill-country of Judea.

66. And all they that had heard them, laid them up^c in their hearts, saying, ‘What manner of child shall this be?’ and the hand of the Lord^d was with him.

67. And his father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Ghost, and prophesied, saying,

68. ‘Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he hath visited and redeemed his people:

69. And hath raised up a horn of salvation for us, in the house of his servant David:

70. As he spake by the mouth^e of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began:

71. That we should be delivered^f from our enemies, and from the hands of them^g, that hate us;

72. To perform the mercy^h promised to our forefathers, and to remember his holy covenant,

^a Vulg. ‘Pugillarem:’ of which see Plin. lib. 13. cap. 2. Ἐν δέλτοις ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ γούνασι θῆκεν, *Batrachomium*.

^b פתח, in Hebrew, signifieth, both to *open* and to *unloose*; and so the *loosing* of his tongue, which is not expressed in the Greek, ‘totidem verbis,’ is implied in the word Ἀνεῖχθη, by a Hebraism.

^c See Gen. xxxvii. 11. Prov. ii. 1; iii. 1; vii. 1.

^d Vulg. “For the hand of the Lord was with him:” contrary to the original, Arabic, and Syriac.

^e “By the mouth,” that is, by the *mouths*; one number for another, as *tree* for *trees*, Gen. iii. 1; *frog* for *frogs*, Exod. viii. 2, &c; yet is the observation of Albertus Magnus ingenious and true,—“All the prophets spake of Christ, uno ore, things so agreeable, as if they had all spoken with one mouth.”

^f In the original, it is only σωτηρίαν, ‘Salvation,’ or deliverance; and so in the Arabic and Vulgar Latin. Now it may be read either in apposition to κέρας, in ver. 69, ‘He hath raised up a horn of salvation,’ namely, ‘salvation from our enemies;’ or in subsequence to the verb, ‘he spake,’ ver. 70; ‘He spake by the mouth of his holy prophets of salvation:’ and this is the more genuine and proper: Beza.

^g Two phrases used to heighten the sense, 2 Sam. xxii. 18. 41. Psal. xlv. 10; lxxviii. 1; lxxxix. 23; and cvi. 10.

^h חסד, as Josh. ii. 12; 2 Sam. ix. 1, &c. The Syriac reads conjunctively, “And he hath showed mercy;” and so doth the Arabic the other clause, “And he hath remembered.”

73. The oath which he swareⁱ to our father Abraham,

74. ^jThat he would grant unto us, that we, being delivered out of the hands of our enemies, might serve him without fear,

75. In holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life.

76. And thou, child, shalt be called the Prophet of the Most Highest; for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord, to prepare his ways;

77. To give knowledge of salvation unto his people, by the remission of their sins,

78. Through the tender mercy^k of our God, whereby the day-spring from on high hath visited us,

79. To give light to them, that sit in darkness, and in the shadow of death; to guide our feet into the way of peace.'

80. And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit; and was in the deserts, till the day of his showing unto Israel."

Reason of the Order.

The order of this section may be briefly contrived and illustrated, thus:—Elisabeth, when Mary cometh to her, was about six months gone with child^l, and about nine months when she departed from her^m. She, coming to her own house, is suspected by Joseph to have played the harlot, and is in danger of a secret divorce. While these things are thus passing betwixt them two at Nazareth, the time of Elisabeth's delivery is fully come.

HARMONY AND EXPLANATION.

Ver. 59: "*They came to circumcise the child.*"

In Hebron, and about the time of Easter, was circumcision first ordainedⁿ. And in the same place, and at the same time of the year, was John Baptist born and circumcised, who was to bring in baptism instead of circumcision; as may

ⁱ ὅρκον: In the accusative case, either in apposition to 'Cornu Salutis,' ver. 69, as Tollet; or κατὰ understood, as Calvin; or following the verb 'to perform,' in ver. 72, as the Syriac, and an old English; or that the verb μνησθῆναι governeth two cases, διαθήκης and ὅρκον.

^j Τοῦ δοῦναι ἡμῖν: This clause standeth in the original, and in all translations, in the end of the verse preceding. See Syriac, Arabic, Vulgar, France, Spain, Dutch, Diodati, Vatab. Erasm. Beza, &c.

^k Greek, σπλάγχνα ἐλέους, 'The bowels of mercy.'

^l Luke, i. 26. 36.

^m Ver. 56.

ⁿ Gen. xvii.

be apparent by observing the time of the angel Gabriel's appearing, and message to his father, Zacharias, in the preceding calendar: and it shall be to the full explained and proved hereafter, when we come to treat of the time of our Saviour's birth.

§ “ *And they called his name Zacharias.*”

A thing hardly to be paralleled again in all the Scripture, that a child should be named by the name of his father; an extraordinary action in an extraordinary case.

Because Abraham and Sarah had their new names given them at the giving of circumcision, therefore did after-times reserve this custom to name their children at their circumcising.

The name was sometime given to the child by the mother, but that was ever at the birth, and it was upon some weighty and special reason^o; and sometimes by the standers by at the birth^p; but the father, at the circumcision, had still the casting voice, whether the name should be so or no, as appeareth by Jacob's changing Ben-oni into Benjamin. Now Zacharias being dumb, and the mother having given it no name at the birth, the persons present undertake to call it by the name of the father.

And now is he in circumcising, that is the man appointed to be the first overthrow of circumcision, by bringing in baptism instead of it.

R. Solomon, from the Talmud, in Sanhedrim, expoundeth Jer. xxv. 10, “ I will take from them the sound of the millstones and the light of the candle,” to this sense: “ The sound of the millstones, signifieth the feast at a circumcision, because they ground or bruised spices for the healing of the sore; and the light of the candle, signifieth the feast itself.” Thus do they confess a decay of circumcision to be foretold by the prophet; and yet they stick not to deny, most stiffly, that circumcision must ever decay.

Ver. 63: “ He wrote, saying.”] That is, ‘ expressing,’ or ‘ to this purpose;’ as, “ And Jethro said to Moses, I Jethro come unto thee^q:” that is, he signified so much by letter, as the serious viewing of the story will necessarily evince. And so, 2 Kings v. 6; “ And he brought the letter to the

^o As Gen. xxix. 32—35, and xxx. 6, &c. 1 Sam. iv. 21. 1 Chron. iv. 9.

^p As Gen. xxxviii. 29, and xxv. 25. Ruth, iv. 17.

^q Exod. xviii. 6.

king of Israel, saying ;” not that Naaman, that brought the letter, spake the words that follow, but the letter itself spake them.

“John.”] “The Lord hath been gracious.” A name most fit for him, that was to be the first preacher of the kingdom of grace, and to point out Him, that was grace itself. “Rabbi Jochanan said, What is the name of the Messias? some said, Haninah, grace; as it is said, I will not give you haninah, that is, the Messias, who shall be called gracious, Jer. xvi. 13^r.”

Ver. 64: “And his mouth was opened.”] Infidelity had closed his mouth, and now faith or believing doth open it again. And herein may this case of Zacharias be fitly compared with the like of Moses^s: for he, for distrust, is in danger of his life, as Zacharias, for the same fault, is struck dumb: but upon the circumcising of his child, and recovery of his faith, the danger is removed; as Zacharias’s dumbness is at such a time and occasion. He believeth, and therefore doth he speak^t; and the tongue of the dumb doth sing^u.

“And his tongue.”] Our English hath added ‘loosed’ for illustration, as also hath the French; and some say it is found in some copies, *Διηρηρώθη*. But, first, no such word is expressed either in the Syrian, Arabic, Vulgar Latin, Italian, Erasmus, or other translators: nor, secondly, needeth there any such word to make a perfect sense; but it may well help the simple and vulgar capacity, what our English hath added.

Ver. 66: “Laid them up in their hearts.”] It could not but affect all, that heard of this strange birth of the Baptist, with wonder, and amazement, and singular observation,—both in regard that so many and great miracles were wrought in this time, when miracles were so much abated and decayed; as also in consideration, that there was never birth before, that had so many concomitants of wonder and miraculousness, as the birth of this child. Not of Isaac, the glorious patriarch; not of Moses, the great prophet; nor of any other whatsoever, that had been in former times.

“And the hand of the Lord was with him.”] Either the special favour and assistance of the Lord^x; or the gift of prophecy at capable years^y; for so the hand of the Lord doth

^r Talmud Bab. in Pesach. cap. 4.

^s Exod. iv.

^t Psal. cxvi. 10.

^u Isa. xxxv. 6.

^x As Ezra, vii. 6, and viii. 22, &c.

^y As 1 Sam. iii. 19.

signify, Ezek. i. 3; xxxvii. 1; and xl. 1; Psal. lxxx. 17; 1 Chron. xxviii. 19.

Ver. 68: “Redeemed.”] Greek, Ἐποίησε λύτρωσιν, “He hath made, or wrought, redemption:” in the very phrase implying a price paid, for so the word Λύτρωσις importeth. It is used again, chap. ii. 38; and by the LXX, Psal. cxi. 9, and cxxx. 7; and by Theodotion for ‘satisfaction,’ Prov. vi. 35.

Ver. 69: “A horn of salvation.”] Psal. xviii. 1; 2 Sam. xxii. 3.

Ver. 70: “Which have been since the world began.”] Adam’s calling his wife’s name *Eve*, or *life*, in apprehension of the promise of the seed of the woman that should break the head of the serpent: Eve’s calling her son’s name *Cain*, ‘a purchase,’ because she had obtained a man, even the Lord, or the Lord to become a man; and her naming her other son, *Seth*, or ‘settled,’ &c.—these were prophecies that spake of Christ from the beginning of the world.

Ver. 71: “That we should be saved from our enemies.”] This hath sweet reference to the promise given at the beginning of the world: from which time he had traced prophecies in the verse preceding: “I will put enmity betwixt thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: he shall break thine head,” Gen. iii. 15. Where, in the former words of the verse, ‘I will set enmity,’ &c. there is an expression, who are our enemies; namely, the serpent and his seed: and, in the latter, ‘he shall break thine head;’ there is an intimation, how we shall be saved: namely, by Christ’s breaking the head and power of Satan. So that the former verse and this being laid together, they arise unto this sense,—that all the prophets from Adam, and upward, had their eye upon the promise in that garden, and spake of salvation and delivery by Christ, by his breaking the head, and destroying the kingdom, of the devil.

Ver. 76: “The Prophet of the Highest.”] As Aaron to Moses, Exod. vii. 1. Prophecy had been now very long decayed, and but little thereof had been under the second temple: it is now reviving in an extraordinary manner: and this child is to be the first of this race of prophets, that is in rising, and to be the harbinger of Christ himself.

Ver. 77: “To give knowledge of salvation by remission,” &c.] The knowledge of salvation, that the law held forth at the first view, was by legal righteousness, and absolute per-

formance of what was commanded: but John, who was to begin the gospel, brought in another doctrine, and gave the people knowledge of salvation by another way; namely, by the remission of sins^z; and this is the tenor of the gospel.

Ver. 78: “The day-spring from on high.”] Greek, Ἀνατολή, used by the LXX^a to translate πῦξ, “The Branch,” the name of Christ; and so it may be understood of Christ’s personal coming and appearance amongst men: as God is said^b to “have visited Sarah;” that is, not only in merciful dealing with her, as to give her a child,—but also in personally coming unto her in visible appearance; “At the time appointed I will return^c,” &c. Or it may be taken in connexion to the sense of the verses preceding: that, after the defect of prophecy, the dawning of that gift, and after the darkness of the doctrine of salvation, as it was in the law, the day-spring of it from on high came now to visit us, in the brightness of the gospel.

Ver. 80: “And was in the deserts.”] Of Ziph and Maon^d, which were places not far from Hebron^e, where John was born. His education was not in the schools at Jerusalem, but in these plain-country towns and villages in the wilderness.

“Till the day of his showing unto Israel.”] That is, when, at thirty years of age, he was to be brought to the sanctuary-service^f; to which he did not apply himself as the custom was, but betook himself to another course.

SECTION VI.

Christ born; published to the Shepherds; rejoiced in by Angels; circumcised; presented in the Temple; confessed by Simeon and Anna.

LUKE, II.

Ver. 1. AND it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree^g from Cæsar^h Augustus, that all the worldⁱ should be taxed.

^z Rom. iv. 6, 7.

^a Isa. iv. 2. Jer. xxiii. 5. Zech. iii. 9, and vi. 12.

^b Gen. xxi. 1.

^c Gen. xviii. 14.

^d 1 Sam. xxiii. 14. 25.

^e Josh. xv. 54, 55.

^f Num. iv. 3.

^g Δόγμα, in the Greek: in Dan. vi. 8. 12.

^h Cæsar, the common name of the Roman emperors; as Abimelech of the Philistine kings, Psal. xxxiv. in tit. and Pharaoh of the Egyptians: from Julius the first emperor, who was of this name; but the name Cæsar was long before him: see Plin. l. 7. cap. 9.

ⁱ Ezra, i. 2.

2. And this taxing was first made, when Cyrenius^j was governor of Syria.

3. And all went to be taxed, every one into his own city.

4. And Joseph also went up^k from Galilee out of the city of Nazareth into Judea, unto the city of David, which is called Beth-lehem (because he was of the stock and lineage of David);

5. To be taxed^l with Mary his espoused wife, being great with child.

6. And so it was, that while they were there, the days were accomplished that she should be delivered.

7. And she brought forth her first-born son, and wrapped^m him in swaddling-clothes, and laid him in a manger; because there was no room for him in the inn.

8. And there were in the same country shepherds abiding in the field, keeping watch over their flock by nightⁿ.

9. And lo, the angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them, and they were sore afraid.

10. And the angel said^o, 'Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people.

11. For unto you is born, this day, in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.

12. And this shall be a sign unto you; Ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling-clothes, lying in a manger.'

13. And suddenly there was with the angel, a multitude^p of the heavenly host, praising God, and saying,

^j In the Roman historians he is called 'Quirinus.'

^k Taking a journey, in Scripture, be it whithersoever it will, is called indifferently, a going up, or going down; as Num. xvi. 12. 14. Jer. xxi. 2. Judg. xvi. 18. Gen. xlii. 3. Judg. xv. 8. 1 Sam. xxvi. 10.

^l Ἀπογράφεσθαι. This word here, and in ver. 1. 3. hath various translations: "That they might be enrolled," Syr. Arab. Rhem.—"That they might profess," Vulg. Eras.—"That they might be taxed," Erasm. again, and our English: all these laid together, make up a complete description of the manner of their taxing. First, they were taken notice of, who were in every town and city, and were enrolled; upon their enrolling, they professed subjection to the Roman state; and, upon this profession, they payed some money, at which they were assessed.

^m Ἐσπαγγάνωσεν: See the Greek in Job, xxxviii. 6, and Ezek. xvi. 4: some, deriving the word from σπαγγάσσω, 'To rend,' conceive that is meant, that his swaddles were poor and ragged, and that this is expressed as a particular of his abasement.

ⁿ Christ born by night; for, if he were born by day, why should the revealing of it be forborne till night?

^o This message of the angel, as it was full of comforts, so also was it of plainness, according to the condition of the men to whom he spake.

^p Or 'the multitude.'

14. 'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men.'

15. And it came to pass, as the angels were gone away from them into heaven, the shepherds^r said one to another, 'Let us now go even unto Beth-lehem, and see this thing which is come to pass, which the Lord hath made known unto us.'

16. And they came with haste, and found Mary and Joseph, and the babe lying in the manger.

17. And when they had seen it, they made known abroad the saying, which was told them concerning this child.

18. And all they that heard it, wondered at those things, which were told them by the shepherds.

19. But Mary kept all these things, and pondered them in her heart.

20. And the shepherds returned, glorifying and praising God for all the things that they had heard and seen, as it was told unto them.

21. And when eight days were accomplished for the circumcising of the child, his name was called Jesus, which was so named of the angel, before he was conceived in the womb.

22. And when the days of her purification, according to the law of Moses^s, were accomplished, they brought him to Jerusalem, to present him to the Lord;

23. As it is written in the law of the Lord^t, 'Every male that openeth the womb, shall be called holy to the Lord;'

24. And to offer a sacrifice according to that which is said in the law of the Lord, 'A pair of turtle-doves^u, and two young pigeons.'

25. And, behold, there was a man in Jerusalem, whose name was Simeon, and the same man was just and devout, waiting for the consolation of Israel; and the Holy Ghost^v was upon him.

^q Or, the good will of God towards men, is glory to God in the highest, and peace on the earth.

^r It hath been held, that these shepherds were about the tower of Edar, Gen. xxxv. 21: and that this was about a mile from Beth-lehem.

^s Lev. xii.

^t Exod. xiii. 1.

^u Mary's poverty, in that her hand could not reach to a lamb, which was the proper offering that the law required, Lev. xii.

^v The spirit of prophecy. It had been long a stranger among the nation, even ever since the death of Zechariah and Malachi; but is now begun to be restored, to speak of the great Prophet near at hand.

26. And it was revealed^w to him by the Holy Ghost, that he should not see death, before he had seen the Lord's Christ.

27. And he came by the Spirit into the temple : and when the parents brought in the child Jesus to do for him after the custom of the law,

28. Then took he him up in his arms, and blessed God, and said,

29. ' Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word :

30. For mine eyes have seen thy salvation,

31. Which thou hast prepared before the face of all people ;

32. A light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel.'

33. And Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him.

34. And Simeon blessed them, and said unto Mary his mother, ' Behold, this child is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel, and for a sign which shall be spoken against;

35. (Yea, a sword shall pierce through thy own soul also,) that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed.'

36. And there was one Anna^x, a prophetess, the daughter of Phanuel^y, of the tribe of Aser ; she was of a great age, and had lived with a husband seven years from her virginity.

37. And she was a widow of about fourscore and four years, which departed not from the temple, but served God with fasting and prayer night and day.

38. And she, coming in at that instant, gave thanks likewise unto the Lord, and spake of him to all them, that looked for redemption in Jerusalem.

39. And when they had performed all things according to the law of the Lord, they returned into Galilee, to their own city Nazareth.

Reason of the Order.

The dependance of the beginning of this section upon the end of that, that went before, doth even prove and con-

^w Κεχηρηματισμένον. This word is used again in this sense, Matt. ii. 12. 22. Acts, x. 22. Heb. xi. 7 : and by the LXX, 1 Kings, xviii. 27 : and in another sense, Acts, xi. 26.

^x Compare 1 Sam. i, and ii.

^y In Hebrew it would be written ' Penuel,' as Gen. xxxii.

firm itself. For after the story of the birth of Christ's forerunner, and the relation of what happened and befel at that time,—what could be expected to come next in order, but the birth of Christ himself? especially, since none of the evangelists mention any thing, that came between.

HARMONY AND EXPLANATION.

“ Ships shall come from the coasts of Chittim, and shall afflict Ashur, and shall afflict Eber :” Num. xxiv. 24.

That by ‘ Chittim ’ is meant ‘ Italy,’ or ‘ the Romans,’ it is not only the general opinion of the Jews, as may be seen in their Targums, and in other writers, but of the most Christians also, yea, of the Romanists themselves, whom the latter part of the verse doth so nearly pinch :—as see the Vulgar Latin and Lyranus upon the place.

This prophecy was fulfilled, when the power of Rome first set her foot upon the neck of the Hebrews by the conquest of Pompey : but, especially, when she tyrannized over Christ, the chief child of Eber, even before and at his birth, as in this story ; but chiefly, in condemning him to death, as in the story of his passion.

As Jacob had before told, that the Jews, at Messias's coming, should be under the subjection of a foreign nation,—so doth Balaam, in this prophecy, show, who that nation should be. And this the more ancient and more honest Jews took notice of, and resolved, that Christ should come in the time of the Roman empire, and near to the destruction of the temple by it. So, in the Talmud^y, they question, “ What is the name of the Messias? Some answer, Hhevara Leprous, and he sitteth among the poor in the gates of Rome, carrying their sicknesses.”

The Chaldee paraphrast, likewise, on Isa. xi. 4, readeth thus,—“ With the speech of his lips shall Messias slay Romulus, the wicked one :” or, the wicked Roman ; showing, at once, his opinion of Christ's coming in the time of the Romans, and also of the Romans being ‘ Ο πονηρός, ‘ the wicked one,’ after a singular manner. Augustus was the second emperor of the Romans, or rather, the first that was entire monarch : for Julius Cæsar, his uncle and predecessor, had hardly enjoyed any monarchical government at all ; nor did Augustus of many years neither ; till he had outed

Lepidus, and overcome Antony, which were copartners with him in the dominion.

His name, Augustus, was given to him for his worthy administration of the commonwealth: for before-time he was called Cæpias^z, and Thurinus^a, and Octavianus; and had like to have been named Romulus, as a second founder of the city; but, by the advice of Munatius Plancus, he was named ‘Augustus,’ which importeth ‘sacredness’ and ‘reverence.’

§ “*That all the world should be taxed.*”

To so vast an extent was the Roman empire now grown, from Parthia to England, and they two also included, that it was a world, rather than one dominion: and so did their own authors boast it in those times: as, ‘Cæsar regit omnia terris:’ ‘Divisum imperium cum Jove^b:’ ‘Totum circumspicit orbem^c:’ ‘Terrarum orbis imperium^d;’—and such-like speeches, usual among them, both in poesy and prose. This huge and unwieldy body, of so large and spacious a dominion, Augustus had now reduced to the healthful temper of peace and quietness: which is the more remarkable, by how much the more wars had been more frequent, and more bloody but a little before. For never had that empire felt so great distemper within itself, as it had done of latter times, in the civil wars betwixt Sylla and Marius, betwixt Julius and Pompey, betwixt Augustus and Antony: not to mention the continual wars that it had abroad. It had not been very long before this time that the evangelist speaketh of, when both Rome itself, and the rest of the world, was at that pitiful plight that Polybius^e speaketh of, That “the Romans were forced to send to Ptolemy, king of Egypt, for a supply of corn, because there was a great scarcity and dearth among them. For in Italy all their corn was destroyed, even to the gates of Rome, by the soldiers; and abroad, there was no help nor supply to be had, there being wars in all parts of the world.” But now is there a universal peace, not only in the Roman empire [so that the temple of Janus was shut up, which it never used to be, when any wars at all were stirring]; but, if we will believe Crantzius, even in those parts and countries, where the Roman power had not yet set her foot,—as Denmark, Norway, and those northern climates,—there was

^z Dion.

^c Ovid.

^a Sueton.

^d Florus.

^b Virgil.

^e Περὶ Πρεσβειῶν, cap. 2.

so great a peace, that, in some places there, money and jewels were hung up by the highway, and there was neither thief nor enemy to take them away. Such times became the coming of Shiloh, the “peaceable one^g,” and such a beginning was befitting the ‘gospel of peace.’

Augustus, having brought the empire under this quiet obedience, like a politic prince, will have it all taxed, and brought into the subsidy-book; that he might know the extent of his command, of his strength, and of his revenues.

And thus we see and may observe Rome come to its entire and absolute monarchy but at this time,—and the state and power that should persecute Christ, in his members, to the end of the world, beginning and born, as it were, at the very same time when Christ himself.

Augustus, as Tacitus^h recordeth of him, did cause an account to be taken of all the empire, and himself had a book and record of it written out with his own hand. “Opes publicæ continebantur: quantum civium sociorumque in armis: quot classes, regna, provinciæ, tributa aut vectigalia, et necessitates ac largitiones; quæ cuncta, sua manu, perscripserat Augustus:” which contained the public revenue, the number of citizens or confederates in the armies; what shipping, kingdoms, provinces, tributes, or subsidies; and relief-money and beneficences. Dion, also, in the life of Augustus, and much also about this time, mentioneth a tax laid by him upon those that dwelt in Italy, whose estates were not less than five thousand sesterces: and poorer than these he taxed not.

Ver. 2: “*This taxing was first made, when Cyrenius was governor of Syria.*”

The tax is dated by the time of Cyrenius’s governing of Syria: First, Because Judea was annexed to Syria, as a member of it; and, in naming the one, the other is included. Secondly, Hereby the loss and want of the sceptre and law-giver, in the tribe of Judah, is the better seen; for the subjection of the Jews, by this, is showed to be in the third degree; they subject to Herod, Herod to Cyrenius, and Cyrenius to Augustus. Thirdly, From Syria had Israel had their greatest afflictions, that ever they had in their own land; as, by Gog and Magogⁱ, or the house of the north^j. And

^g Isa. vi. 9.

^h Annal. lib. i. 11.

ⁱ Ezek. xxxviii.

^j Dan. xi.

Luke, deriving the taxing of the Jews from Syria, calleth those things to mind: and layeth, as it were, the last verse of Dan. xi, and the first of Dan. xii, together.

The taxing is said *first* to be made in his time: as, first, Denying that ever there was such a universal taxation in the empire before; for the empire was never in that case of universal quietness to be taxed before. And, secondly, Importing the taxes of that country, that followed after; Augustus, at this very time, laying the platform, subjection, and submission of the empire, for succeeding posterities. And here, let it be said again, in exact propriety, beginneth the Roman monarchy: and is far from being any of the four mentioned Dan. ii, or vii.

Josephus^k mentioneth Cyrenius's coming into Syria, after Archelaus's death, "To do justice, and to assess and tax every man's goods; and he came into Judea, which was now annexed to Syria, and did so there." Now Archelaus reigned after Herod^l, and reigned till Christ was about ten years old; for ten years he reigned, as saith the same Josephus^m: and, therefore, either Cyrenius came twice into Syria to lay taxations, as Funccius concludeth; or else Josephus faileth here, as he doth not seldom elsewhere, in chronology.

Ver. 3: "*And all went to be taxed.*"

This taxing was first by kingdoms and countries, then by cities and towns, and then by poll.—First, Kingdoms and provinces were divided one from another. Secondly, Cities and towns, in every kingdom and province, were also particularized; and notice given, that every one should repair to the place, to which, by stock and descent, they did belong. Thirdly, The people being thus convened in their several cities, their names were taken and enrolled; and so the Greek word, here used, doth signify in the nearest propriety. Then did they make profession of subjection to the Roman empire, either by some set form of words,—or, at least, by payment of some certain sum of money, which was laid upon every poll.

And now, first, are the Jews entering under the yoke of that subjection, which they never cast off again, but it pressed them into a final desolation even to this day. Secondly, They had voluntarily brought this misery upon themselves, in

^k Antiq. lib. 18. cap. 1.

^l Matt. ii.

^m Antiq. lib. 17. cap. 15.

calling in the Romans in their civil wars. Thirdly, No spark of their former freedom and authority is left among them; for their king and lawgiver is clean gone. Fourthly, They are now to be enrolled and registered for vassals to all succeeding generations. Fifthly, They must now leave their own occasions, and many of them their own houses, to attend their own bondage and misery: and thus “it is in the words of our Rabbins, If thou see a generation that hath many afflictions, then look for the Redeemerⁿ.”

Ver. 4: “*And Joseph also went up from Galilee,*” &c.

Whether it were for the fear of Herod, that had a murderous spite at the stock of David,—or for the more commodiousness for his trade,—or for whatsoever else it was that Joseph, a Beth-lemite, became a resident in Galilee,—surely it was the wondrous disposal of the Lord, that a decree from Rome should bring him now from Galilee to Beth-lehem, that the prophecy of Christ’s being born in that place might take effect.

Ver. 7: “*She brought forth his first-born.*”

This is to be understood according to the propriety and phrase of the law, agreeable to which it speaketh. Now, the law, speaking of the first-born, regardeth not, whether any were born after or no, but only that none was born before. As Hur is called the first-born of Ephrath^o, and yet no mention of any child that she had after,—so Christ is here called the first-born; not as though she had any children besides, but to show, that in him was fulfilled what was typified by the first-born under the law, who was as king, priest, and prophet, in the family, and ‘holy to the Lord.’

And so, likewise, in that speech of Matthew^p, “He knew her not, till she had brought forth her first-born;”—it implieth not that he knew her after, for the word *till* enforceth no such thing,—as see the Geneva notes upon the place; but the evangelist’s intention is to clear the birth and generation of Christ from any carnal mixture of Joseph and Mary, before he was born.

And here it is not unseasonable to look a little narrowly into the time of our Saviour’s birth,—namely, the time of

ⁿ From Isa. lix. 17, 18. Jer. xxx. 6, 7, &c. D. Kimch. in Isa. lix.

^o 1 Chron. ii. 19.

^p Chap. i. 25.

the year, at which he was born, as we have done into the year itself, or the time of the world, heretofore.

The year of the world, as we observed then, was 3928.

The year of Augustus is neither so necessary to seek, nor so easy to find: partly, because there is some difference among historians about the number of the years of his reign; and partly, because there may be some about the year of Tiberius, in which Christ was baptized, from which we should count backward. For though it be said^a, that John came baptizing in his fifteenth year, yet may it be questionable, whether he baptized Christ in that year or no. But, not to swerve from the most common consent of Roman historians, that say that Augustus reigned six-and-fifty years,—and of Christians, that hold that Christ was baptized in the fifteenth of Tiberius,—then may it be readily concluded, that he was born in the forty-second of Augustus.

The time of the year at which he was born, hath been much mistaken, being concluded upon, at the latter end of December. This mistake did first arise by another: for it being misunderstood that Zacharias was the high-priest, and that he was in ‘Sancto Sanctorum,’ on the expiation day, when the angel Gabriel appeared unto him,—they could do no less than conclude, that John was born in the middle of summer,—and Christ, in the middle of winter: a time very unfit for people to travel to their several cities to be taxed; but far more unfit for shepherds to lie abroad in the fields all night.

For finding out, therefore, the true and right time of his nativity, these things are to be taken into consideration:—

First, That the time that Christ lived here upon the earth was two-and-thirty years and a half, exactly: and so long did David reign in Jerusalem, 2 Sam. v. 4, 5.

This time was divided into two unequal parts: twenty-nine years complete he spent as a private man, before he was baptized; for it is said^r, ‘he began to be thirty,’ or ‘was entering upon this thirtieth at his baptism;’—and three years and a half from his baptism to his death. This sum was precisely told of by the angel Gabriel^s, “In half that week shall he cause sacrifice and oblation to cease;” and is plainly parcelled out by Passovers, and other circumstances of time^t.

^a Luke, iii. 1.

^r Luke, iii. 23.

^s Dan. ix. 27.

^t Matt. iv. 2. John, i. 29. 35. 44; ii. 1. 13; v. 1; vi. 4; and xiii. 1.

Secondly ; That the time of Christ's death was at Easter, or their Passover, as is most plain by all the evangelists.

Thirdly ; That he living just two-and-thirty years and a half, and dying at Easter,—it must needs follow, that he was born about the middle of the month Tisri, which answereth to part of our September. And it is not only probable, but also necessary, if he lived thirty-two years and a half exactly, that then, as he died upon the fifteenth day of the month Abib, or at the Passover,—so that he was born about the fifteenth day of Tisri, at the feast of tabernacles: a month and a feast that had been exceedingly renowned in ancient times. In this month, the world had begun, and sin had entered into it: in this month, were all the fathers born before the flood, as the Jews aver, and reason confirms it: from this month, began the circle of the year from the creation, to the redemption out of Egypt: from this month, began the typical year of jubilee, in the ages after: and in this month, were the three famous feasts of trumpets, of expiation, and of tabernacles. And like glorious things may be observed upon the feast of tabernacles itself: at that very time, did Israel fall upon the making of the tabernacle in the^u wilderness; at this very time, was the consecration of the temple^x; and at this very time, was our Saviour born, and began to carry the tabernacle of his flesh; and at this very time, was he baptized, and began the ministry of the gospel. So that here appeareth one addition more to the present misery and subjection of the Jews at the time of this tax; that not only they must leave all their occasions, to wait upon their own taxing, and promote their own bondage,—but that they must neglect a main part of the service of God, the feast of expiation, and the feast of tabernacles^y, to attend the conqueror and their own thralldom.

And now, it being considered that John the Baptist was but half a year older than our Saviour, it will be observable, how the four points of the year, as it may be so said, were renowned with their conception and nativity. John, conceived at the summer solstice,—and our Saviour, at the winter; John, born at the vernal equinox,—and our Saviour, at the autumnal.

^u Exod. xxxv.

^x 1 Kings, viii. 2.

^y As Zech. xiv. 16, 17.

§ “ *And wrapped him in swaddling-clothes.*”

This passage is one ground-work whereupon expositors conclude, that ‘Christ was born without pain to his mother:’ for that she performed the midwife’s part herself, and none to help her. A second is this, That ‘he was born without his mother’s pain, because he was conceived without her pleasure.’ A third argument may be fetched from the blessing of propagation, given to our first parents in the garden: and a fourth, from the example of the delivery of the Hebrew women in Egypt. For, first, When God gave this blessing to Adam^z and Eve in their innocence, “increase and multiply,” it enabled them to beget children agreeable to their own perfection; that is, holy, righteous, and without any symptoms or consequents of sin, either in themselves, or in the mothers. But they never begat any child thus, because of their sudden fall. What! did this first blessing then utterly fail, and never take effect, in its proper sense and full extent? Could such emphatical words of God to man in innocence, fall to the ground without performance? No; they took place in the second Adam, who was born according to the full extent and intent of that blessing to our innocent parents, in perfect holiness and righteousness, and without pain to his mother. Secondly; If the Hebrew women in Egypt had so quick and easy a delivery, as that they were not like to other women; much more may we think the travail and delivery of the Virgin to have been quick, lively, miraculous, and painless: “Before her pain came, she was delivered of a man-child^a.”

§ “ *Because there was no room for them in the inn.*”

At the return out of Babylon, the children of Beth-lehem were a hundred and twenty-three persons^b. Now that being four hundred and fifty years past, and somewhat above; to what a multitude might the stock or breed of that city be grown by this time of Christ’s birth? This multitude pressing together to their own city, according to the emperor’s edict, the weakest go to the wall, and Joseph and Mary are excluded out of the inn: and thus the free-woman and her son are cast out of doors, as the bond-woman and her son had been^c.

^z Gen. i. 28.^a Isa. lxvi. 7.^b Ezra, ii. 21.^c Gen. xxi.

Ver. 8: “*And there were shepherds,*” &c.

The patriarchs, to whom Christ was more especially promised, were of this vocation^d, especially Abraham and David, to whom the promise was more clearly made; peculiarly David, who was feeding sheep near to Beth-lehem, when he was taken a father and type of Christ^e. And it doth illustrate the exactness of the performance the more, and doth harmonize with the giving of it the better, when to shepherds it is first revealed, as to shepherds it was first promised. Compare this with the visions of Jacob and Moses with their flocks^f, and of Samson’s mother in the field^g.

§ “*Keeping watch over their flock by night.*”

Greek, “*Keeping the watches of the night.*”] For the night was divided by the Jews into four watches, of three hours a piece. The first, or beginning of watches, is mentioned Lam. ii. 19: the second and third, Luke xii. 38: the fourth, Matt. xiv. 25: this was called also the morning watch, Exod. xiv. 24. Howbeit, the Talmud, from Judg. vii. 19, divideth it only into three. Be it the one or the other, these shepherds, it seemeth, observed such an order, as that they watched by course, while others slept: or, not to take it so very strictly, they lay now in the fields, and watched their flocks all night, which had been in a manner impossible to have done, in the deep of winter, at which time our calendar hath placed Christ’s nativity.

Ver. 9: “*The glory of the Lord shone,*” &c.

That is, ‘an exceeding great glory;’ for so do the Hebrews heighten their expressions,—as ‘cedars of the Lord,’ that is, ‘goodly cedars:’ such an exceeding great glory shone about Paul^h; that, at noon-day;—this, in the dead of the night.

Ver. 13: “*A multitude of the heavenly host,*” &c.

It might not improperly be rendered, ‘*The multitude;*’ as importing, that all the choir of angels, or the whole multitude of that celestial militia, was now knit together in a concert, for the praises and acknowledgment of Christ: according to that of the apostleⁱ, “*When he bringeth in the first-*

^d Gen. xlvii. 3. ^e 1 Sam. xvi. 11, 12. ^f Gen. xxxi. 10. Exod. iii. 3.
^g Judg. xiii. 9. ^h Acts, xxvi. 13. ⁱ Heb. i. 6.

begotten into the world, he saith, And let *all the angels of God* worship him.” And thus, as all the angels sang at the beginning of the old world, or at the creation^k,—so do they at the beginning of the new, and of the redemption.

Angels are called ‘the heavenly host^l.’ And, in this sense, Rab. Menahem understandeth Gen. ii. 1; “Thus were the heavens and the earth finished, and all their host;” that is, saith he, ‘the angels, whose creation Moses nameth not elsewhere.’

Ver. 14: “*Glory to God in the highest,*” &c.

The last words of this verse, the Vulgar Latin readeth, “to men of good will;” contrary to the Syrian, Arabic, and to the ancient Greek copies; as appeareth by Greg. Nazianzen^m, and Andreas Jerusolomitaniⁿ.

The whole verse is but one proposition, or axiom, in which the last clause of all is the subject, and the two former are predicated of it. And it lieth in this sense, “The good will of God to men, showed in the incarnation of our Saviour, when God himself disdained not to take the nature of man, is glory to him in the highest, and is peace upon the earth.” And that this is the genuine and proper meaning and posture of the words, may be observed; first, By the conjunction *καὶ*, *and*, put between ‘glory to God,’ and ‘peace on earth;’ and none between *them* and *good will*. And, secondly, The very sense and matter itself enforceth this construction: for, first, *Εὐδοκία ἐν ἀνθρώποις*, beareth the same sense here that *Εὐδοκία ἐν Χριστῷ* doth [Matt. iii. 17, xvii. 5], of ‘God’s good will,’ or ‘well-pleasedness’ with men. Now, secondly, This well-pleasedness of his with men, was expressed and evidenced at this time, in the birth of our Saviour, in that God had assumed the nature of men, and it had never been so cleared and demonstrated before. So that, thirdly, The birth of Christ being the occasion of the angels’ singing this song,—the good will of God towards men, revealed in this his birth, must needs be the subject of their song. And then, fourthly, The other two things expressed in the two other clauses, ‘glory on high,’ and ‘peace on earth,’ must needs be understood as predicates; seeing that, being laid to this expression of God of his good will towards men, they are but

^k Job, xxxviii. 7.

^l 1 Kings, xxii. 19. Job, xxv. 3.

^m Orat. 42.

ⁿ In Orat. de Salutatione Angeli, &c.

as fruits and consequences of it. And this reading and construction, how facile and plain is it, in comparison of these intricacies and obscurities, that those readings bring with them, that either break the verse into three distinct axioms, or into two,—or that read Εὐδοκίας, in the genitive case, or Εὐδοκίᾳ in the dative, as may be seen in expositors.

Now, how the ‘good will,’ and ‘well-pleasedness’ of God towards men, exhibited and showed in the incarnation and birth of our Saviour, did glorify God in the highest, in all his attributes of wisdom, truth, justice, power, mercy, &c; and how it wrought peace on earth, betwixt man and himself, and man and angels, and man and man, and man and his own conscience,—might be showed at large, if we were common-placing, instead of commenting.

Ver. 21: “*And when eight days were accomplished for the circumcising,*” &c.

It was necessary, that Christ should be circumcised, that he might both bear the badge of a child of Abraham, and have upon him an obligation to the keeping of the law: for he that was circumcised, was a debtor to the whole law^o.

Ver. 22: “*And when the days of her purification,*” &c.

At forty days old^p, the Lord cometh to his own temple: and by an old man, and an old woman, is proclaimed both to young and old, that expected redemption. Herod had heard no tidings of him, as yet, by the wise men; for, otherwise, this had been an opportunity for him to have put in practice his bloody and malicious intent. Mary is purified according to the custom of the law, although she had contracted no pollution, by her childing and bringing forth; partly, that Christ in nothing might be wanting to the law,—and partly, that this might be an occasion for the first public declaration of him by Simeon and Anna.

Ver. 25: “*A man, whose name was Simeon.*”

This Simeon seemeth to be he, whom the Jewish authors name for the son of Hillel: and who was the first that bare the title of ‘Rabban,’ the highest title that was given to their doctors, and which was given but to seven of them.

Hillel was the famous head, or principal, of that school,

^o Gal. v. 3.

^p Lev. xii. 1—4.

that is so renowned in the Jewish authors, by the name of ‘Beth Hillel.’ Out of which [as they relate] there came thousands of scholars, but fourscore especially, of most renown. “Hillel the old [they are the words of the Talmud] had fourscore scholars. Thirty of them were fit, in whom the divine majesty should rest, as it did on Moses. Thirty of them were worthy, for whom the sun should stand still, as it did for Joshua: and twenty were of a middle rank between. The greatest of them all, was Jonathan Ben Uzziel, that paraphrased the prophets in the Chaldee tongue; and the lowest of them, was Jochanan, the son of Zaccai.”

Such a father had this our Simeon, and so renowned,—but himself infinitely more renowned in the thing that is now in hand, and in his having the Saviour of the world in his arms and heart. Now, this is the genealogy of this man, as it is recorded by the Jews themselves:—Hillel begat Simeon, who was first titled Rabban: Rabban Simeon begat Rabban Gamaliel, the tutor of Paul: Rabban Gamaliel begat Rabban Simeon the second: Rabban Simeon the second begat Rabban Gamaliel the second: Rabban Gamaliel begat Rabban Simeon the third: Rabban Simeon the third begat Rabbi Juda, the holy: Rabbi Juda begat Rabban Gamaliel the third.

These six Rabbans were of the line of Hillel; besides whom there was a seventh, that bare the same title, of another stock,—Rabban Jochanan Ben Zaccai.

But it may be justly questioned, if Simeon were the man we suppose,—namely, the son of Hillel, and the father of Gamaliel; and, if he were so holy and devout a man, and confessed Christ, as this evangelist relateth of him,—how came it to pass, that his son Gamaliel was so far contrary, as appeareth by the education of Paul in Pharisaical righteousness, and persecution of the truth?

Answer. First, It is no strange thing for holy fathers to have wicked children: witness Eli, David, Josaphat, and common experience.

Secondly, It was thirty years from Simeon’s acknowledging of Christ, to Gamaliel’s education of Paul, or little less; and so much time might wear out the notice of his father’s action, if he had taken any notice of it: especially, his father dying shortly after he had made so glorious a confession.

§ “ *Waiting for the consolation of Israel.*”

It is an article of the Jewish creed, “ To believe the coming of the Messiah, and to wait and wait for his coming, although he defer it:” which foolishly they do, even to this day, after sixteen hundred years expired since he came. But Simeon’s expectation is neither so vain, nor so uncertain: for, besides the general expectation of the whole nation, that the Messiah should appear about that time^q, he had it by a special and assured revelation^r.

The coming of Christ, is called ‘ the consolation of Israel,’ from Isa. xlix. 13, lii. 9, and lxvi. 13; Jer. xxxi. 13; Zech. i. 17, and such-like places, which the Jews do not only apply to the coming of the Messiah,—but also, in their Talmud^s, questioning what his name should be when he came, some conclude it to be ‘ Menahem,’ ‘ The Comforter,’ from Lam. i. 16.

Ver. 26: “ *That he should not see death^t, before he had seen the Lord’s Christ.*”

This was the time, when the nation expected that Messiah should appear^u, and began to look for redemption near at hand^v. The angel Gabriel to Daniel, and he to the people, had so determinately pointed out the time^w, that not only Jews of all nations^x are gathered to Jerusalem, against the expiring of that prophecy; but also, all the east was possessed with the opinion of a prince to rise about these times, of supereminent honour, glory, and dominion^y.

Simeon, having learned the time with the rest of the studious of the nation, out of the Scripture, hath the certainty of it sealed up to him by the spirit of prophecy, which assured him, that the time of so great expectation was so near at hand, that he, though he were old, yet should not die, till he had seen what he desired: and thus prophecy, that was departed from Israel so long ago, is returning and dawning to it again, to be as the morning star, to tell that the Sun of righteousness would rise ere long.

^q Luke, xix. 11.^r Luke, ii. 26.^s In Sanhedr.^t As Psal. lxxxix. 48; and “ to see corruption,” Psal. xvi. 10.^u Luke, xix. 11.^v Luke, ii. 38.^w Dan. ix. 26, 27.^x Acts, ii.^y Baron. in Appar. &c. Sueton. Virgil, &c.

Ver. 35: “*Yea, a sword shall pierce through thine own soul also.*”

These words seem to be of the same tenor and intent with those of our Saviour to Peter, John xxi. 18,—and to tell Mary of her suffering martyrdom for Christ and the gospel, as those do of his. For Simeon having, in the preceding verse, related, how Christ, both in his person, and in the gospel, should be as a sign to be spoken against, persecuted, and opposed, “*yea (saith he), and thou, his mother also, for his and the gospel’s sake, shalt drink of the same cup, and partake of the same lot; for the sword of persecution shall go through thy life also:*” for so the word *ψυχή* doth often signify.

§ “*That the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed.*”

This clause is linked to the latter end of the verse preceding, and reacheth beyond the parenthesis that lieth before it; and, in conjuncture with the clause before that, it maketh this sense,—that Christ’s being set up for a sign to be spoken against, or persecution for the gospel’s sake, should detect many men’s tempers and affections, which were not descried nor revealed before, and discover what malignity or sincerity to him and to his cause is in their hearts, as Matt. xiii. 21; and as it is at this day.

Ver. 36: “*The daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Aser.*”

Hannah, a widow indeed^z, that is, not by divorce, but by the death of her husband, and now of above a hundred years of age, is chosen also, and actuated by the Holy Ghost, to give testimony of Christ, as Simeon had done,—that, out of the mouth of two such witnesses, of either sex one, the thing might be established, and the party witnessed unto, might be the more taken notice of. Her father Phanuel is named, as either being a noted and well-known man in those times, or for the significancy of his name, made good in her, in that she now beholdeth the Lord face to face^a. And thus the New Testament doth, by this prophetess, as the Old Testament doth by divers of the prophets, in naming her and her father with her^b. Phanuel, her father, was a Galilean; for in Galilee lay the tribe of Aser; and from thence cometh a prophetess

^z As 1 Tim. v. 3. 5.

^a As Gen. xxxii. 30, 31.

^b As Isa. i. 1. Jer. i. 1. Joel, i. 1, &c.

now, to declare and publish the great Prophet, that must once appear thence to the wonder of the nation.

Ver. 37: “*Which departed not from the temple.*”

Her constant continuance there might be, either because she was a poor widow, and so maintained upon the foundation; or, because she was a prophetess, and so lodged in some of the buildings or chambers belonging to the temple; for so might women do^d.

SECTION VII.

Christ, at two Years' old, is visited and honoured by the wise Men. The Children of Beth-lehem murdered. Herod dieth soon after. Christ returneth out of Egypt.

MATT. II.

Ver. 1. “Now when Jesus was born in Beth-lehem of Judea^e, in the days of Herod the king, behold, there came wise men^f from the east to Jerusalem,

2. Saying, ‘Where is he, that is born King of the Jews? For we have seen his star in the east, and are come to worship him.’

3. When Herod the king had heard these things, he was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him.

4. And when he had gathered all the chief priests and scribes^g of the people together, he demanded of them, ‘where Christ should be born?’

5. They said unto him, ‘In Beth-lehem of Judea: for thus it is written by the prophet,—

6. And thou, Beth-lehem^h, in the land of Juda, art not the leastⁱ among the princes of Juda: for out of thee shall come a governor, that shall rule my people Israel.’

7. Then Herod, when he had privily called the wise men, inquired diligently of them, what time the star appeared.

^d As 2 Chron. xxii. 11, 12.

^e Vulgate, ‘Juda:’ and this is conceived by Jerome, to be the better reading: because it is so written, ver. 6: but, in this verse, the evangelist telleth, it was in ‘Beth-lehem of Judea,’ to distinguish it from ‘Beth-lehem in Galilee,’ Josh. xix. 15: and in ver. 6, he saith, it was in the land of Judah; to distinguish it from the lot of Benjamin.

^f ‘Wise men, Gr. *Μάγοι*, which word is reserved by the Syriac, Arabic, Italian, and, generally, by all Latins: the French readeth it *sages*, in the sense of our English.

^g *Γραμματεῖς*, in the LXX, Exod. v. 6. Josh. i. 10. 2 Sam. viii. 17. Jer. xxxvi. 10. Ezra, iv. 8, and vii. 12: and *Γραμματοεισαγαγεῖς*, Deut. i. 15.

^h *Γῆ Ἰούδα*: for *ἐν Γῇ*, as John, i. 4; the preposition is understood.

ⁱ The LXX, in Micah v, use *ὀλίγιστος*, speaking of smallness of number; but Matthew, *ἐλάχιστος*, speaking of smallness of bulk, or dignity.

8. And he sent them to Beth-lehem^j, and said, ‘Go, and search diligently for the young child; and when ye have found him; bring me word again, that I may come and worship him also.’

9. When they had heard the king, they departed; and lo, the star, which they saw in the east, went before them, till it came and stood over where the young child was.

10. When they saw the star, they rejoiced with exceeding^k great joy.

11. And when they were come into the house, they saw the young child with Mary his mother, and fell down and worshipped him: and when they had opened their treasures, they presented unto him gifts; gold, and frankincense^l, and myrrh.

12. And being warned of God in a dream, that they should not return to Herod; they departed into their own country another way.

13. And when they were departed, behold, the angel of the Lord appeareth to Joseph in a dream, saying, ‘Arise, and take the young child, and his mother, and flee into Egypt; and be thou there until I bring thee word: for Herod will seek the young child to destroy him.’

14. When he arose, he took the young child and his mother, by night, and departed into Egypt.

15. And was there until the death of Herod: that it might be fulfilled, which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying ‘Out of Egypt have I called my son.’

16. Then Herod, when he saw that he was mocked of the wise men, was exceeding wroth, and sent forth, and slew all the children that were in Beth-lehem, and in all the coasts thereof, from two years old and under, according to the time he had diligently inquired of the wise men.

17. Then was fulfilled that, which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying,

18. ‘In Rama^m was there a voice heard, lamentations, and weeping, and great mourning; Rachel mourning for her children, and would not be comforted, because they are not.’

^j Beth-lehem distant from Jerusalem thirty-five furlongs (Just. Mart. Apol. 2), four miles, and almost a half.

^k As *שש ואיש* Isa. lxi. 10.

^l “Gold and frankincense they shall bring in; and merchandise also, for a present to the king Messias, and for the house of the Lord.” D. Kimch. on Isa. lx. 6.

^m Rama was the birth-place of Samuel, 1 Sam. i. 19, &c.

19. But when Herod was dead, behold, an angel of the Lord appeareth in a dream to Joseph in Egypt;

20. Saying, 'Arise, and take the young child, and his mother, and go into the land of Israel: for they are deadⁿ which sought the young child's life.'

21. And he arose, and took the young child, and his mother, and came into the land of Israel.

22. But when he heard that Archelaus did reign in Judea, in the room of his father Herod, he was afraid to go thither: notwithstanding, being warned of God in a dream, he turned aside into the parts of Galilee.

23. And he came, and dwelt in a city called Nazareth, that it might be fulfilled, which was spoken by the prophets; 'He shall be called a Nazarite.'"

Reason of the Order.

To confirm and prove the order of this section and story, requireth some labour, because of an opinion ancient, and current among men, that crosseth the laying of it in this place. It hath been generally held and believed, almost of every one, that the wise men came to Christ, when he was but thirteen days old; and it is written in red letters in the calendar, as if it were a golden truth, by the title of Epiphany, at the sixth of January:—an opinion, which if it were as true as it is common, it were readily known where to place this story of the wise men's coming; namely, between the circumcision of our Saviour, and his presentation in the temple,—betwixt ver. 21 and 22 of Luke ii.

But, upon serious and impartial examination of this opinion, these rubs and unlikelihoods lie in the way, and make it as incredible for the improbability, as it seemeth venerable for its antiquity.

To omit the length of their journey, from their own country to Beth-lehem, their preparation for so long a journey before they set out, and their stay at Jerusalem by the way [for I cannot think that all, that passed there, while they were there, was done in an instant],—how utterly improbable it is, that, after all this hubbub at Jerusalem, upon the wise men's question, 'where is the king of the Jews,'—and after Herod's curious scrutiny and inquiry, where the child should be,—and after his implacable indignation, upon the

ⁿ Compare Exod. iv. 19.

wise men's deluding or mocking of him, as he did conceive,—that the child, that he had thus eagerly hunted after, should, after all this stirring and searching, come to Jerusalem, as it were, into his very mouth,—and there be publicly proclaimed by Simeon and Anna in the temple, to be the very same, that the wise men and Herod, though with different intentions, looked after. For, first, it is to be observed, that it was seven-and-twenty days from the time, that this opinion bringeth the wise men to Beth-lehem,—to the time that Joseph and Mary brought Jesus to the temple. Now it is not imaginable, but that, in all this time, Joseph, that was but at so few miles' distance, should hear what was done at Jerusalem upon the wise men's coming thither [if so be they told him not themselves], and how Herod took the matter, when he missed of their unexpected return. Secondly; For aught that can be found in the text to the contrary, it may be well supposed, that they had their divine warning not to return again to Herod, while they were at Beth-lehem; and Joseph might well be acquainted by them with it. Thirdly; It is not to be doubted, but they had despatched what they did at Beth-lehem, in far less time than seven-and-twenty days: and surely, of all men, they will not deny this, that will bring them out either of Arabia, or Persia, to Beth-lehem, in half the time:—and as little to be doubted, that Herod, in the compass of so much time, saw the disappointment of his expectation of the wise men's return, and breaketh out into choler against the poor infants of Beth-lehem. Fourthly; Now all these things being laid together, how senseless a thing will it be, to make Joseph to bring the child, for whom all this business was, under the tyrant's nose? Fifthly; Or if Joseph did not know of all these things [which is almost impossible], yet, how is it imaginable, that Christ should have escaped the tyrant, being at Jerusalem, and so publicly acknowledged, and spoken of? It is true, indeed, that he might have been sheltered by the divine power; but we see, by his flight into Egypt, that it was not the will of God, to use that miraculous means of his preservation as yet, but another.

And [which is the reason, that hath moved me to lay this story after our Saviour's presentation in the temple,—yea, and to suppose him to be two years old, or thereabout, when the wise men came] the text saith, in plain

terms, that “ Herod sent and slew the children, from two years’ old and under; according to the time, that he had diligently inquired of the wise men :” now, his inquiry was of the time of the star’s appearing, ver. 7 ; and he slew from two years’ old and under, according to the time that he had inquired ; and, therefore, how can it be thought otherwise, than that it was two years, or thereabout, since the star appeared,—and, consequently, so long since Christ was born ? But, that this may appear past all exception, and that the opinions, that bring the wise men to Christ, before his presentation in the temple [for there are two several ones to that purpose,—that of the thirteenth day, mentioned before ; and another, of some, that hold they came not so soon as on that day, but yet, within the forty days of Mary’s lying in, or before her purification], let it not be too tedious to the reader, to take a view of all the arguments that are, or can be, used, for aught I yet understand,—either for the confirmation of the two opinions, which we refuse, viz. of the wise men’s coming before Christ was forty days old,—or, for the overthrow of this, which we embrace, that he was two years’ old, or thereabout.

Object. 1. The very word γεννηθέντος, in ver. 1, doth import, that his birth was but newly past, being of that nature, as to signify a thing but very lately done, or even in doing.

Answ. This grammatical observation is not constantly and currently true. For μνηστέυσεως, a word of the very same tense and form, yet signifieth a thing done above a quarter of a year before : and the word itself, γεννηθέντα, in our daily creed, and σταυρωθέντα, &c. speak of things past sixteen hundred years ago.

Object. 2. The star appeared two years before our Saviour’s birth ; but the wise men came not to him, till thirteen days after.

Answ. This argument is used by some, but those but a few ; not considering how impossible it was, that the wise men should know the exact time of his birth, but by the time of the star’s appearing. And it is not only the general opinion even of all, but also dictated by reason itself, that the star was not the harbinger of his birth, much less so long before ; but the concomitant and attendant upon it.

Object. 3. The wise men came, while Mary lay in at

Beth-lehem; but Herod, either in policy, or for some other occasion, deferred the murder of the children till two years after.

Answ. This both the text and common sense contradicteth. For, first,—in reason,—what policy could there be in deferring, when the longer he forbear, the harder it would be for him to find him, for whom he sought? Secondly, The text telleth, that as soon as he saw himself mocked by the wise men, he fell to the murdering of the children: and he might see whether he were mocked by them, or not, within a short space after their departure from him at Jerusalem.

Object. 4. In that speech of the evangelist, “Herod slew all the male children from two years old and under, according to the time that he had inquired of the wise men:” the latter words, “according to the time that he had inquired,” have relation to the words, “and under;” and to the words, “from two years old.” For this seemeth to be added by the evangelist to this purpose,—that he might signify, that all under two years old were not slain: but only those that were thereabout, and which were born before the star’s appearing, and not after. For he thought not, that this royal child was born, after it appeared. But all that were about two years old, he slew; lest, if happily Christ had been born before it appeared, or miraculously grown, above the quality of such an age,—he might have escaped out of his hands. And, therefore, as he dilated his murder for place, comprehending the coasts of Beth-lehem under the cruelty, as well as the town itself,—so also did he it for a time, slaying those that were born, before the star’s appearing, as well as at it.

Answ. This, as Baronius confesseth, is a new-found gloss upon that text; and he took himself for the inventor of it, till he met with it in Jansenius, who, like a great wit, had jumped with him; both straining the utmost of their invention to gild over their calendar tenet, of the wise men’s coming on the thirteenth day. But, first, to omit the strange shape and uncouthness of this exposition,—which easily showeth itself to any eye, that is not bleared with prejudice and partiality;—as also, secondly, their confident scrutiny and knowledge of Herod’s thoughts;—let it but, thirdly, be weighed in the balance of indifferency: what colour of sense, or equality of policy, can be seen in this carriage of Herod,

to slay all, that were born two years before the star, and none of a day after, or very few? For might he not suspect, that the star was a forerunner of the birth, as well as a consequent? and that Christ might be born a week or fortnight after it, as well as before? Judge, therefore, how these men that hold, and that truly, that it appeared but just at Christ's birth, can handsomely stitch that opinion and this together.

Object. 5. But the wise men found Christ at Beth-lehem: and what should he do there at two years old? For St. Luke also saith^p, that when Joseph and Mary had performed all things according to the law [he meaneth, at the time of her purification, when Christ was now but forty days old], they departed to Nazareth. So that, if the wise men came after these forty days, they must have found Christ at Nazareth, and not at Beth-lehem.

Ans. And, first, to the question, how came he to be at Beth-lehem at two years old? An answer hath been framed to this long ago, by some few, that have been of this opinion, that we embrace; namely, that some of the three festivals, in which every male was to appear before the Lord, drew his parents, and him with them, to Jerusalem; and they took Beth-lehem in the way; and there the wise men find him. A resolution, with which, if there were no other to be had, one might rest satisfied reasonably well; yet, a more serious searching into the text, will give a more warrantable reason and better assurance than this, which is but one man's supposal:—and that is this, that, as the parents of Jesus knew, that it was necessary that he should be born in Beth-lehem, because of the prophecy that had told of it before,—so also did they think it as necessary, that he should live and be brought up there, because of his alliance to the house of David: and, from thence they durst not remove him, till they had special warrant: and warrant they had none, till the angel dismiss them into Egypt. This is not a groping of their thoughts, only by surmisal, as was theirs of Herod's mentioned before,—but there is plain and evident demonstration for it in the text: for when Joseph, in Egypt, was commanded by an angel after the death of Herod, to return to the land of Israel, it is said, “He was afraid to go into Judea, when he heard that Archelaus reigned instead of Herod.” Now, what should he do in Judea? Or why should

he rather think of going thither, than into his own country, Galilee,—but that he thought of returning to Beth-lehem again, from whence he had come; supposing that the education of the Messias had been confined thither, as well as his birth: but, “being warned and warranted by an angel in a dream, he then departed into Nazareth^a.” By which words it is apparent, not only that he durst not go to his own home, till he had divine commission; but also that he had never been in Nazareth, since Christ was born, till this his coming out of Egypt: otherwise, he would have addressed his thoughts thither, and not to Judea.

And by this are we to expound the text of Luke alleged, “When they had performed all things according to the law, they departed to their own city, Nazareth:” namely, that he speaketh briefly, in what he saw Matthew had handled at large before: and not so much intending to show Christ’s quick departure into Galilee, after his presentation in the temple, as to draw you to look for him in Galilee, at the next story following, which fell out very many years after. And that such brief transitions are no strange thing in Scripture, might be showed at large, but more especially in the evangelist St. Luke, that we have in hand: as, to spare more,—in chap. iv. 14,—he bringeth our Saviour, as it were, from the pinnacle of the temple, into Galilee; as if his journey thither, had been the first thing he did: whereas, he returned with the devil into the wilderness again; and from thence came to John at Jordan, before he set for Galilee. And, Acts ix. 18, 19, &c, where, under these few words, ‘Saul was converted and baptized, preached in Damascus a good season, was laid in wait for, and escaped over the wall, and went to Jerusalem;’ he hath comprehended a story of him of three years, and hath omitted his journey from Damascus into Arabia, and to Damascus again, before he set for Jerusalem; as Paul himself hath parcelled it out, Gal. i.

Object. 6. But why should the wise men stay so long, after they had seen the star, as not to come to Jerusalem, and to Christ, of two years after?

Answ. So did Moses lie within a day’s journey, or little more, of his wife and children^r, a whole twelvemonth together, within a few days; and yet they came not at all together, not for the distance of the places where they were, but

^a Ver. 22.^r Exod. xviii, &c.

because of the divine disposal of the Lord, for a special reason.

And so it was with these men: it was not the distance of their country from Judea, were it either Arabia or Persia; nay, had it been the utmost India, that kept them away so long,—for they might have travelled it in half the time; but it was the divine dispensation of the Lord, that detained them back for so long a time,—partly, that Christ's stay in Beth-lehem may leave no excuse behind, if they would not know him; but chiefly, that the child and mother might gather some competent strength against their flight, which, God foresaw, would follow upon the wise men's coming.

HARMONY AND EXPLANATION.

Ver. 1: “*In the days of Herod the king.*”

This Herod was the son of Antipater, an Edomite, or of the seed of Esau, as was said before; although Nicholas Damascen (for which Josephus correcteth him) aver, that he was of the race of the chief of the Jews, that came up out of Babylon. His father Antipater, growing into acquaintance and favour with Julius Cæsar, had the government of Judea committed to him. And he again substituteth his son Phasaelus in the rule of Jerusalem, and of the country thereabout; and his other son, Herod, who is here spoken of, in the ruling of Galilee. Herod, by his prowess and policy, endeared himself to the succeeding rulers of the Roman state; but, more especial, by observance and promises, to Antony, and, by his means, to Augustus, whilst they two kept correspondence in the swaying of the empire: these two, by the consent of the senate, make him king of Judea; a man composed, as if they were his four elements, of fawning, policy, cruelty, and unconscionableness. Of whose life and actions Josephus, Egesippus, and others, have discoursed at large, and it is not seasonable to insist upon them here. This only is not impertinent to inquire after,—what year it was of the reign of Herod, when this story of the wise men's coming to Beth-lehem, and the butchery upon the children there, fell out; that it may be seen how long our Saviour was in Egypt, before his return upon the tyrant's death; and how soon it was, that the Lord overtook this and the other cruelties of the tyrant with deserved vengeance.

Josephus^s hath placed the beginning of Herod's reign, under the hundred and eighty-fourth Olympiad, and under the consulship of C. Domitius Calvinus II, and C. Asinius Pollio; and hath summed the length of it to four-and-thirty years, from the death of Antigonus, his competitor,—and seven-and-thirty from the Romans' first declaring of him king^t. And with this reckoning of the years of his reign, agreeth Egesippus^u; and so doth Eusebius, in his Chronicle, for the latter sum of seven-and-thirty, but differeth far from the beginning of his reign, placing it under the last year of Olympiad 186; eight years, at least, after the time prefixed by Josephus. And reason he hath, indeed, to differ from his beginning. For, if Herod began his reign in the consulship of the men forenamed, and reigned but thirty-and-seven years from thence,—it will result, in the conclusion, that he died the year before our Saviour was born; as may be easily cast, by the catalogue or number of consuls from Cn. Domitius and Asinius Pollio, which was after the building of the city, anno 714, to Cornelius Lentulus and Valerius Messalinus, under whom our Saviour was born,—which was anno urbis, 751. So that, this account of years, that Josephus hath given, though it be true for the number, yet can it not be so from that beginning, from whence he hath dated them. What then? Shall we begin the thirty-seven years of his reign, from the time that he was king entire, and without corrival in the kingdom, by the death of Antigonus, the last spark of the Asmonean fire? Why, herein also, I find Dion differing from Josephus, and Eusebius from them both. For, whereas Josephus hath related, that the sacking of Jerusalem, by Socius, and the death of Antigonus, were under the consulship of M. Agrippa and Canidius, or Caninius Gallus, which was anno urbis conditæ, 717; Dion, in his Roman History^v, hath placed the crucifying of Antigonus, and the making of Herod king, by Antony, under the consulship of Claudius and Norbanus, which was A.U.C. 716, or a year before. And Eusebius hath still laid Herod's beginning a year or two after.

Baronius hath found out a date different from all these; namely, that Herod's years of his reign are to be begun from

^s Antiq. lib. 14. cap. 26.

^t Antiq. lib. 17. cap. 10.

^u De Excid. Hierosol. lib. 1. cap. 45.

^v Lib. 49.

the time that he received his crown from the hands of Augustus, after his victory of Antony, at the battle at Actium; Cæsar being then in Rhodes: of which story Josephus maketh mention^w; Augustus being then a third time consul, and Valerius Messala Corvinus his partner. By which account it will follow, that our Saviour was born in the nine-and-twentieth year of Herod's reign: and that Herod lived, till he was about nine years old. Which opinion, though it best suited to the salving of other passages of Josephus in chronology, about this time,—yet it seemeth to be something too corrosive an application, and a remedy very harsh, upon these respects:—

First; Because, by this account of his, both about the wise men's coming, and Herod's death, he will have Christ to be nine years in Egypt, or thereabout,—or, according to our reckoning, seven years, or little under. Now, in his banishment from his own country, the means of his parents' and of his own subsistence in a foreign land, for so long a time, is so hard to imagine, that it will breed another and no less a scruple than that in hand.

Secondly; The transition of St. Luke, from his presenting in the temple, to his coming into Nazareth, will seem a great deal the more harsh, if eight or nine years are to be taken in between, especially with such as Baronius himself, who will have nothing to come between at all.

Thirdly; By this opinion must our Saviour be nineteen years old and more, at the death of Augustus: and then, how could he be but beginning to be thirty in the fifteenth of Tiberius^x? For suppose, with the cardinal, that he was nine years old at the death of Herod, then was he nineteen at the banishment of Archelaus; who reigned ten years, as appeareth by Josephus^y. After Archelaus was removed from his kingdom, the same Josephus nameth Cyrenius and Coponius, as rulers and disposers of Judea, for a season. And, after Coponius, Marcus Ambibucus was ruler; and, after him, Annus Rufus; and then died Augustus. Now, lay all these together,—and it will follow, that our Saviour could not be less than above twenty years old, at the death of Augustus; whereas it is most plain, by the gospel, that he was but about fifteen. Let us, therefore, take these parcels backward; and, as they confute the opinion under question, so

^w Antiq. lib. 15. cap. 10.

^x Luke, iii.

^y Antiq. lib. 17. cap. 15.

do they help to settle and resolve the question in hand. For, grant that Coponius, Ambibucus, and Rufus, ruled their single years a piece, after the exile of Archelaus (as it is most like they did, and more than a year a piece they could not do, all things well laid together), and take before them the ten years current of Archelaus, and we have thirteen years backward of our Saviour's fifteen, at the death of Augustus; and this doth bring us to his two years of age, or thereabout; which was the time when the wise men came to him. So that, since Archelaus began to reign, when Christ was not very much above two years old; for that he was something above [it may be some months], the time that Archelaus wanted of ten years' reign complete, will allow; and, that he could not be more than such a space above, the premises, well ponderated, will conclude,—it will readily and plainly follow, that our Saviour's birth was in the five-and-thirtieth year of Herod: and this murder, of the children of Beth-lehem, in his seven-and-thirtieth; but a month or two, or such a space, before his death. Now, whereas some stick not to say, that he was struck with the wound of death that very night that the children were slain, and died not many days or hours after,—in that we cannot be so punctual: but that he lived not many months after, is more than probable, by the collections and computations mentioned, well weighed, and laid together.

§ “*Wise men.*”

That is, ‘sorcerers,’ or ‘magicians,’ and so might it not unfitly be translated. For, first, though ‘Magus’ and ‘Magia’ admit of a gentle construction, and be often taken, not only in a harmless, but in a laudable sense, in profane authors, yet are they never so in Scripture; and by the idiom and propriety of that, must the word be expounded; and not by foreign and heathen language and acceptation. It is true, indeed, that, among the Persians, the Magi have been renowned for men of excellent wisdom and skill in natural and in other things,—and that none were admitted to reign among them, unless he were well versed in the learning of the Magi: and that Plato, Tully, Philo, Pliny, and others, do extol ‘Magia,’ or ‘magic,’ to be the very height and perfection of philosophy. But the Scripture, which is ever the sure expositor of itself, doth never take the

word but in the worst sense, for the devilish and damnable practice and practices of sorcery and unlawful arts^z.

And the Babylonian *אשפות* or 'wizards,' are so called by the Greek of Daniel, whosoever translated it, whether the LXX, or Theodotion, or who else soever, Dan. i. 20, and ii. 2, &c. Now, it is against sense and reason to refuse the sense of Scripture, for a Scripture word,—and to fetch the interpretation of it from Persia, Plato, Pliny, and I know not whence.

2. It doth the more set forth the lustre and glory of the birth of Christ, and the power of himself and kingdom, by supposing that these men, that had been hitherto devoted to the arts, service, and converse, of the devil, should now forsake them, and him, and their own delight, and their old profession,—and dedicate themselves, travails, and gifts, to a child unknown, far off, and but poorly born.

3. Nor is this opinion but newly minted, but it carrieth with it the passport and privilege of antiquity. For Ignatius Martyr, in his epistle to the Ephesians, speaking concerning the wise men's star, saith thus, "Ενθεν ἐμωραίνεται σοφία κοσμική, γοητεία ὕθλος ἦν, καὶ γέλως ἡ μαγία: "Then the wisdom of this world grew foolish, sorcery a toy, and magic a derision:" personating the men, in both their contrary professions and devotedness, devilish and divine, to Satan and Christ. So, likewise, Justin Martyr, in his dialogue with Trypho, speaking of these same men, and how they were qualified and affected before they came to Christ,—he saith, "they were ἐσκυλευμένοι πρὸς πάσας κακὰς πράξεις τὰς ἐνεργουμένας ὑπὸ τοῦ δαιμονίου ἐκείνου, captived or led away, as a prey by the devil, to all evil actions." And so Theophylact, the mouth of Chrysostom,—“They were (saith he) adversaries, or enemies, to God; and devoted to devils in a more special manner.” And to this sense doth the Gospel of Matthew, in Hebrew, render the word; whosoever translated it. But, to spare more, those fathers confess their opinion to be the same with these [and those neither mean ones, nor a few], which hold, some of them, that these Magi had obtained their knowledge, concerning the King of the Jews, from Sibylla Erythræa; and others, from Balaam; to whom, they hold, that they stood in relation, not only of

^z Acts, viii. 9, Simon *μαγεύων*: Acts, xiii. 8, Elymas *ὁ Μάγος*.

nation and kindred, but also of the same profession and art of wizardy and magic.

§ “*From the east.*”

This doth something confirm the foregoing opinion of their being magicians; if it need any more confirmation. For that the east was infamous for sorceries, auguries, and incantations, is apparent by Isa. ii. 6: as it is understood by the LXX, by R. Solomon, D. Kimchi, and even approved by the context itself. But what country of the east this was, whence these men came,—is as hard to determine, as it was, what manner of men they were. Divers have asserted, that they were of Chaldea; minding, it seemeth, rather the strictest and worst sense, of both the words, ‘Chaldæus’ and ‘Magus,’ which signify both one and the same ungodly profession,—than the letter of text, and of other Scriptures. For it plainly telleth, that these came from the east; and all the prophets that have spoken of the destruction of Jerusalem, by the Chaldeans, have fetched those destroyers from the north^a.

Others, therefore, do hold them for Persians; and that, chiefly, because the word ‘Magus’ is thought to be originally a Persian word.

But, first, as was said before,—the Scripture word is to be interpreted according to the Scripture idiom; and so it confineth them to Persia no more than to any other country. Secondly; If it should be averred, that the Persian Magi grew renowned from a family of that name, or from some ancestor that was called ‘Mag,’ or ‘Mago,’ rather than from any relation that the word hath to the depth of learning, or any notation for a great scholar,—I suppose it would be hard to prove the contrary; especially, since, in Babylonia, there was Rab-Mag^b, or, the great Mag,—and, in Carthage, Mago,—two noblemen, or princes, and, for aught we know, no great scholars neither, of the very same name.

More probable, therefore, and plausible, is their opinion [though it leave the reader in a Bivium of irresolution], that holdeth these men either for Arabians or Mesopotamians, about Haran: but their resolution is the best of all, that bring them from Arabia; and of this mind is Justin Martyr, very confidently, insomuch that he applieth a prophecy thereto,

^a As Jer. i.

^b Jer. xxxix. 3.

namely, Isa. viii. 4, about the breaking of the strength of Damascus.

For, first, Arabia is full eastward from Judea, and the inhabitants thereof are constantly called men of the east^c.

Secondly ; The gifts, or presents, that the wise men offered Christ, were native commodities of the land of Arabia ; as gold of Sheba^d,—frankincense from Seba, or Saba, as in the verse, “sua thura Sabæi,”—and myrrh from thereabouts, as appeareth in stories : and it is more probable to think, that they would bring the choice commodities of their own country, as Jacob sent to Joseph, than of another.

Thirdly ; To conceive these men for Arabians, doth very well sort and harmonize with some considerable things in Scripture. As, 1. The first proselyte to the Jewish church that we find mentioned in Scripture, was Jethro, an Arabian, and of the seed of Abraham ; and so, if we hold these first proselytes to Christ, it suiteth very fitly. 2. It agreeth also with that prophetic Psalm mentioned before ; namely, Psalm lxxii. 3. With the rule, and dominion, and homage, that David and Solomon, types of Christ, had over, and from, that country. For, 4. Much of Arabia was the land of Canaan, as well as Judea. For, the heedful eye that shall but seriously look upon the nations, that planted there at the first, will find, that the whole country was inhabited by the two sons of Ham, Cush and Canaan ; and, in after time, that the seed of Abraham dispossessed them, and dwelt in their steads, not by any usurpation or injustice, but upon the promise made to Abraham of Canaan’s land, and upon just title, by his victory over the four kings, which, having but lately subdued those lands, were subdued by him ; and, with the conquest, the right and challenge to that land fell to Abraham. And hence it was, that David and Solomon dilated their dominion over these countries, even to Euphrates ; and then was the promise to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, concerning their children’s possessing the land of Canaan, fulfilled to the utmost extent. Now, it is more likely to bring these first-fruits of the Gentiles to do homage to the King of the Jews, from a country which did as much to David and Solomon, who were types of him, than from a foreign nation ; and to conceive that they were of the seed of Abraham, rather than of another race.

^c As Gen. xxv. 6. Judg. vi. 3. Job, i. 3.

^d Psal. lxxii. 15.

Ver. 2: “ *Saying, ‘ Where is he that is born King of the Jews? for we have seen his star in the east,’ ” &c.*

The exposition of this verse will be made up, by the resolution and answer of these three questions :—1. What was this star, that the wise men saw? 2. Where it was, that they saw it? And, 3. How, upon the sight of it, they could conclude, that it did relate to a King of the Jews? To omit the various guesses and surmises that are made for the satisfaction of the first query, it seemeth to me, that this star, which these magicians saw at the birth of Christ, was nothing else but that glorious and miraculous light, that shone about the Beth-lehem shepherds, when the angel came upon them, with the tidings of the birth of a Saviour^e: and that, these wizards being that night abroad [belike, at their study of astrology], beheld it at distance, and to them it seemed, being so far off, like a new, and uncouth, and a wondrous star. And the words, “ in the east,” do mean the place of the men, and not of the star; and are to receive this construction, ‘ we, being in the east, have seen his star:’ not it in the east part of heaven, but they being in the east part of the earth. And their beholding it to be in the land of Judea, might the more readily bring them to think it betokened the birth of the King of the Jews.

And thus are the three questions resolved together, if the groundwork, whereupon all is built, be but firm and solid; viz. that the light or the glory of the Lord, that shone about the shepherds, was that which the wise men then supposed, and do now call, a star; upon which, let us look a little, and see what probability there may be that it was so.

First, then, It is past doubting, that the shepherds saw the glory of the Lord shine round about them; and the wise men, the new star shine at a distance from them, at one and the same time,—namely, at the time of our Saviour’s birth. For, since both these things were, to both these parties, as a messenger, to impart unto them the tidings of the birth of Christ, no reason can be given or supposed, why they should not appear to them both, to do this message to them, at the very time when he was born. Now, the shepherds at Beth-lehem, and the magicians in Arabia, seeing, on the very same night, a light that was to tell them

^e Luke, ii. 9.

of the very same thing,—what reason have we to think, that it was not one and the same light ?

Secondly ; To conceive that the wise men's star appeared to them in the east part of heaven, maketh the matter far more difficult to resolve, how they came to know that it denoted a King of the Jews, than by supposing, that they saw it hanging over the very centre, or middle, of the land of the Jews. For, though we cannot but acknowledge, that the Spirit of God was their chief intelligencer and instructor in this matter, and so could have taught them so much, where-soever they had seen the star appear,—yet, can we not but think, that it was a likelier way to read this lesson to them, by setting this light upon the very place where the King, that it betokened, was born,—rather than in the east part of heaven, where it might seem to denote something among the Indians, rather than among the Jews.

Thirdly ; We know it by experience, that a great light, or fire, that happeneth in any place in the night, be it never so great in itself, or in the eyes of those that are in the place where it is,—yet, to those that are a great distance off, it seemeth but as a star, or such a thing. And that it might not be so with the wise men in this matter, there is neither analogy of faith, probability in reason, evidence in Scripture, or any thing I know of, will deny.

And lastly ; It is not to be omitted, without weighing, that,—as soon as the wise men, after their conference with Herod, were gone out of Jerusalem, to set for Beth-lehem,—the star showed itself to them again. It appeareth now nearer to them, to conduct them to the place where the child now was, as it had appeared at greater distance at his birth, to signify to them that he was born.—Then they saw it over, or in, Judea, which directed them to hearken to Jerusalem ; now, they see it at Jerusalem, almost over their heads, to direct them to Jerusalem.

Ver. 3 : “ *He was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him.* ”

Herod, for fear of the loss of his kingdom,—and Jerusalem, for fear of the disturbance of their state. For he, having been so long the king of Judea, as seven-and-thirty years, and having laid the foundation of a successive royalty to his family, in so much policy and cruelty as he had done,—how would this make him to startle, to hear of a King

newly born unto the nation; whose subjection, his thoughts and endeavours had promised to his own children; and to have the certainty of the thing confirmed from heaven, by a wondrous and miraculous light! And, how must it needs perplex the Jews, also, to hear of a new King over them, besides Herod, who was set over them by their lords, the Romans! For, how ill would the Romans take it, that their determination and decree of Herod's reigning over Judea, should be so affronted, as that a new King should rise among them! And what could follow upon this, but the Roman armies, and the Jews' misery? Or, if they understood this King to be Messiah [as the nation now looked for his coming], yet could it not choose, but breed some perplexity in them, partly to think of the rareness of the matter, and chiefly, of their being in subjection to so potent a nation as the Romans, when their deliverer should appear.

Ver. 4: "*All the chief priests.*"

Since there was properly but one high-priest at once among the Jews,—by the 'chief priests,' so often mentioned in the gospel, some have understood those high-priests, that, by the Roman governors, or otherwise, were turned out of their office,—as, about these times, that matter was ordinary. So Josephus recorded, that Valerius Gratus first made Ismael high-priest, instead of Ananus; then deposeth him, and maketh Eleazar, Ananus's son; him again he deposeth, and maketh Simon Fitz Kamithus; and, in his room again, he setteth Joseph, surnamed Caiaphas: which Caiaphas was also removed by Vitellius, and Jonathan Fitz Ananus placed in his stead. And these men, thus turned out of office, are called (as they suppose), both here and elsewhere, the 'chief priests.' But their opinion is far more warrantable and agreeable to truth, that, by the 'chief priests,' understand the several heads of the families, or the chief of the four-and-twenty courses, into which David had divided and ordered the priests^f; which are therefore called, 'chief priests;' not so much for primacy or superiority, that they had in their ecclesiastical function above the rest of the clergy; as, 1. Because they were heads of their houses; and, 2. Because they were of the great council, and made a third part of the seventy elders.

^f 1 Chron. xxiv.

§ “*And scribes of the people.*”

He calleth them ‘scribes of the people,’ to distinguish them from the secretaries or clerks of particular men; as Baruch was the scribe of Jeremiah,—and Seraiah, the scribe or secretary of David^g. But these, of whom mention is here, and so very frequently in the gospel elsewhere, were not such private or peculiar clerks, but they were the public scribes or clerks of the people: and this their office or function consisted in two particulars:—

First; They were the men, that took upon them to copy the Bible for those, that desired to have a copy. For so great and various is the accuracy and exactness of the Scripture text in the mystical and profound significances of letters, vowels, and accents, that it was not fit that every one should offer to transcribe the original, or that every vulgar pen should copy things of so sublime speculation. Therefore, there was a peculiar and special order of learned men among the Jews, whose office it was to take care of the preservation of the purity of the text, in all Bibles that should be copied out, that no corruption or error should creep into the original of the sacred writ: and these were called the “scribes of the people,” or their scriveners or writers of the copy of the Bible. And hence is it that there is so frequent mention in the Rabbins of ‘Tikkun Sopherim,’ ‘the correction,’ or ‘direction of the scribes,’ or their peculiar and special disposing of the text, which the Masora, at the beginning of the Book of Numbers, observeth to have been in eighteen places, which are reckoned there. These scribes may be conceived to have been either priests or Levites, or both; the men of that tribe being the chiefest students in the Scriptures; and being bound, by their calling, to be able to instruct the people in the same^h.

They had eight-and-forty universities, as it were, belonging to that tribe, for the education of the clergy in the knowledge of the law and the prophetsⁱ; and from among the learned of those students, were some set apart for this office, which required profound learning and skill;—namely, to be the copiers of the Bible, when any copy was to be taken; or, at least, to take care, that all copies, that should be transcribed, should be pure and without corruption.

^g 2 Sam. viii. 17.^h Deut. xxxiii. 10. Mal. ii. 7.ⁱ Josh. xxi.

Secondly ; These also were the public and common preachers of the people, being more constant pulpit men, than any other of the clergy ; taking on them, not only to be the preservers and providers for the purity of the text, but also the most constant and common explainers and expounders of it in sermons. Therefore it is said of our Saviour, that he taught as one that had authority, and “not as the scribes,” Matt. vii. 29 ; where the scribes are rather mentioned, than any other order, because they were the greatest and most ordinary preachers. And our Saviour himself, in Mark xii. 35, “How say the scribes, that Christ is the son of David,”—instanceth in the scribes only [whereas the Pharisees, Sadducees, and even all the nation of the Jews, held the same opinion], because the scribes were the men that were ofttest in the pulpit, and preached more than any other : and so this doctrine was heard more from them than others.

And thus was Ezra a ready scribe in the law of Moses^j, both for the copying, and preserving pure, the text of the Scripture, and also for the expounding of it by his sermons. And such a one is the scribe, that our Saviour speaketh of ; that is instructed to the kingdom of heaven, that bringeth out of his treasure instructions out of the New Testament and Old^k. The Chaldee paraphrast on Jer. vi. 13, and viii. 10, and in other places, instead of ‘the prophet,’ readeth ‘the scribe ;’ taking, as it seemeth, ‘the prophet’ in the same sense that Paul^l doth prophesying, for the preacher,—and making the text speak in the same tenor that it doth here, “the priests and the scribes.”

In the story of our Saviour’s arraignment, and elsewhere in the New Testament, there is mention of the chief priests, and scribes, and elders^m ; importing, that the great council consisted of these three sorts of men ; ‘The chief priests,’ of the seed of Aaron ; ‘the scribes,’ of the tribe of Levi ; and ‘the elders of the people,’ mere laymen : these were all deeply and extraordinarily versed and learned in the law ; but the practice of this their learning had some difference,—as the civil, common, and canon :—1. The elders judged the people, and matters of debate and controversy, but instructed not the people by way of preaching or ministry.

^j Ezra, vii. 6.

^k Matt. xiii. 52.

^l 1 Thess. v. 20. 1 Cor. xiv. 5, &c.

^m Matt. xxvi. 3. Mark, xv. 1.

The chief priests judged and instructed, but it was more by resolving questions and doubts that were proposed to themⁿ, than by commonly preaching homilies or sermons. The scribes were they, that were the preachers or lecturers, and taught the people from the pulpit, as well as determined upon doubts and debates: and to this triple division of the great and seraphical doctors of the Jews, St. Paul seemeth to allude^o: “Where is the wise? where is the scribe? where is” the questionist, or “disputer of this world?” By the first, meaning the elders of the people,—and by the last, the chief priests.

§ “*He demanded of them, where Christ should be born?*”

“The high-priests were rightly consulted (say the Rhemists), in question of their law and religion: for whom should Herod ask, but those that were most likely to give him an answer?” But the latter end of their note carrieth a snare with it to entrap the simple: “And be they never so ill (say they), they are often forced to say the truth by privilege of their function.” They think they have an undeniable groundwork for this their doctrine, from the prophesying of Caiaphas, John xi. 51, as their notes plead there, ascribing that his prophesying to his priesthood and order; whereas the text ascribeth it to the year and season: “This he spake not of himself, but, being high-priest that year, he prophesied:” where the emphasis lieth not in the words, ‘being high-priest,’—but in the words, ‘that year,’ which was the year of sending down of the gifts of the Spirit, in a measure and manner, never known before or after.

Ver. 6: “*And thou, Beth-lehem, in the land of Juda,*” &c.

There is no small difference in this quotation of the scribes or of the evangelist, or indeed of both, from the letter of the text of the prophet from whom they cite it; nor doth this difference rise by the evangelist’s following the translation of the LXX, as oft there doth, for it differeth much from the letter of the LXX also, but it is upon some special reason. Which disagreement that we may reconcile, and the reason of which that we may see the better, we will take up the verse verbatim, and the differences, as they come to hand, one by one.

ⁿ As our Saviour asked them questions, Luke, ii. 46. Hag. ii. 11. Mal. ii. 7.

^o In 1 Cor. i. 20.

First, then, whereas St. Matthew readeth, “Thou, Beth-lehem, in the land of Juda,” the Hebrew hath it only, “Thou, Beth-lehem Ephratah,” without any mention of the land of Juda at all: and so the Chaldee; and so the LXX, but only with the addition of one word, “Thou, Beth-lehem, the house of Ephratah, art the least,” &c.

Answ. First; There are that give this general answer to all the differences in this quotation, that the scribes and the evangelist tie not themselves to the very words of the prophet, but only think it enough to render his sense. And this answer might be very well entertained, and give good satisfaction, especially since that, in allegations from the Old Testament, it is usual with the New so to do,—but that the difference between the text and the quotation is so great, that it is not only diverse, but even contrary. Some, therefore,

Secondly, Conceive, that the scribes could allege the text no better without the book, and that the evangelist hath set it down in their own words, for the just shame of those great doctors, that were no better versed in the Scripture, than to allege a place in words so very far different from the text. But he that hath been any whit versed in the writings of the Jews, will find their Rabbins or doctors to be too nimble textualists to miss in a text of so great use and import: especially if he shall but consider, to what a height of learning they were now come, by the tutorage and pains of the two great doctors of the chair, Shammai and Hillel, who had filled all the nation with learned men, the like had not been before.

Thirdly; Whereas some talk of a Syriac edition, which the Jews used at that time more than the Hebrew, and which had this text of Micah as the evangelist hath cited it, and that he cited it according to that edition which was most in use;—here are two things presumed upon, which it is impossible ever to make good. For who ever read, in any Jew, of a Syrian edition of the prophets, besides the Chaldee paraphrast? who, we are sure, readeth not thus:—or what Christian ever saw such an edition, that he could tell that it did so read? For this particular, therefore, in hand, it is to be answered, that the scribes, or the evangelists, or both, did thus differently quote the prophet, neither through forgetfulness, nor through the misleading of

an erroneous edition, but purposely, and upon a rational intent.

For, first, though Ephratah had been the surname of Beth-lehem, in ancient time^m, and in the times of the prophet Micah, yet it is no wonder if that title of it were now out of use, and especially out of the knowledge of this irreligious king. For the seventy years' captivity, and the alterations of the state, did alter the face of the country, and might easily blot out of use and remembrance such an additional title of a town as this.

Secondly; This surname of the town was taken up in memorial of a woman, as appeareth 1 Chron. ii. 19: and when the discourse concerning Christ, and where he should be born, was in hand and agitation, it was more pregnant to bring his birth-place to have reference to Judah, from whom Herod, though he were ignorant in other particulars concerning his birth, knew he should descend, than to a woman and a title, which, it is like, that he had never heard of before. So that this,—that, in the scribes, might, at the first, seem to be a mis-allegation of the prophet through some mistake,—being precisely looked upon, with respect had to the times when the prophecy was given, and when it is now cited,—and to the several persons to whom,—it will show to be so quoted upon very sound wisdom and profound reason; these words, 'in the land of Juda,' being used by them for necessary illustration, instead of the word 'Ephratah,'—not as proposing it for the purer text of the prophet, but as more suitable, by way of exposition, for the capacity and apprehension of Herod.

In Micah's time, the name Ephratah was common; but, in after times, it may be, it was disused. Howsoever, Micah prophesied to the Jews, to whom this title 'Ephratah' was familiar; and, it is like, had the scribes spoken to Jews too, they would have retained that title; but to Herod, who was not so punctually acquainted with it, it was not proper to bring a phrase that he could not understand, or that was uncouth to him; therefore, they explain it by one, that was familiar both to him and the whole nation,—'Beth-lehem, in the land of Juda.'

^m As Gen. xxxv. 19. Ruth, iv. 11.

§ “*Art not the least.*”

This clause is far farther from Micah's text than the other; for, whereas here is a very strong and emphatical negation, οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ, in the prophet there is none at all, either in the Hebrew, in the LXX, or in the Chaldee paraphrast. And, indeed, the text and the quotation are one clean contrary to another; in Micah, “Though thou be little;” but in Matthew, “Thou art not the least.” Towards the reconciling of which difference, it will be necessary, in the first place, to take a serious survey of the prophet's text; and then, upon the true interpretation of it, to lay this allegation to it, and to see how they do agree. The words in the Hebrew, whereupon the main doubt riseth, are but these two צַעִיר לְהִיֹּת: which our English rendereth, “Though thou be little.” The Septuagint, “Thou art the least to be among the thousands:” but using a differing word to signify ‘the least,’ from that used here. “Some books,” saith Nobilius, and the other scholiast upon the LXX, “read, Art not the least,”—as Jerome, Tertullian, and Cyprian: but this their reading I suspect rather to be taken from this quotation of the gospel, than found by them in the text of Micah. The Vulgar Latin, “Thou art little among the thousands;” &c. The Italian of Brucioli, and the French, ‘Being little to be,’ or ‘to be accounted.’ And much to the same tenor with our English, Aben Ezra and David Kimchi. Rabbi Solomon sheweth his construction of it in this gloss;—“It were fit, thou shouldest be the least among the families of Juda, because of the profaneness of Ruth, the Moabitess, that was in thee; yet out of thee shall come,” &c. Jansenius saith, a reconciliation might be made between the prophet and the evangelist, by reading the prophet's text by way of interrogation, “And thou, Beth-lehem, art thou the least?” which answereth in sense to ‘thou art not.’ But, to all these interpretations alleged, this one thing may be opposed,—that the Hebrew word צַעִיר cannot properly agree with the word ‘Beth-lehem,’ according to the syntax of substantive and adjective; because they are of two different genders, as the grammarian will easily observe, and cannot but confess. For Beth-lehem is of the feminine gender, as are all the names of cities; and צַעִיר of another, as it plainly appeareth by its termination. To construe them, therefore,

together, as substantive and adjective,—as it is unwarrantable by the grammar, so doth it make a sense utterly irreconcilable with this of the evangelist. To which might be added also, that these words, being thus conjoined and construed together, do make but a harsh sense and construction among themselves, amounting to this, “Thou, Beth-lehem, in being little, out of thee shall come a ruler.”

Their interpretation, therefore, is rather to be embraced, that take כְּעֶזְרָא in the neuter gender, as it pleadeth itself to be, by its very termination,—the masculine and neuter in the Hebrew being indifferently taken the one for the other,—and do read it thus: “And thou, Beth-lehem Ephratah, it is a small thing to be among the princes of Judah; out of thee shall come a ruler,” &c. As meaning this, that ‘it is the least of thine honour, that thou art reckoned among the princes of Juda, as equal with them; for thou hast a dignity above this, and above them all, in that out of thee shall come a ruler, which shall feed my people.’ And to this sense and tenor should I interpret the Chaldee paraphrase, though I know, indeed, that it is generally construed another way: “Chizgner havetha leithmannaah:” “And thou, Beth-lehem Ephratah, art within a little to be superior,” or perfect, “among the thousands of Judah,” &c. As let the learned in the language judge, whether the words in the Chaldee will not bear that sense: especially the sense of the first word, ‘Chizgner,’ being looked into, in the Chaldee paraphrast, in Psal. ii. 12, and lxxiii. 2, Hos. i. 4, and in other places.

The text of the prophet, then, being rendered in this interpretation, this allegation of the evangelist will be found, not to have any contrariety to it at all, but to speak, though not in the very same words, yet to the very same tenor and purpose: for while the one saith, ‘It is a small thing, that thou art among the princes of Judah,’ and the other, ‘Thou art not the least among them,’ they both fall into the same sense, or at least into no disagreement of sense at all. For if it were to be reputed a small honour to Beth-lehem, to be reckoned in equality with the other princes of Judah, in comparison of a greater honour that she was to have, in the birth of the Messias,—it must readily follow, what this quotation of the evangelist inferreth; namely, that she was not the least among them. And thus doth the evangelist express the prophet’s mind, though he tie not his expression to his

very words, alleging his text to its clearest sense, and to the easier apprehension of the hearer. It is a just exception, indeed, that Jansenius taketh at this interpretation,—because that the Scripture useth not to express this sense, ‘It is a small thing,’ by the word *רע*, but by *מעט*, as Isa. vii. 13, Gen. xxx. 15, and in other places: but as it is true, that it often useth *מעט* for that expression; so it is most true, that it useth not that word alone, but others also: as *תקטן* in 2 Sam. vii. 19, and *נקל* in Isa. xlix. 6, and why not *רע* then as well here?

§ “*Among the princes of Juda.*”

In Micah it is, “Among the thousands of Judah:” and so it is translated by the LXX, the Chaldee, the Vulgar, and unanimously by all other translators: so that here is yet another difficulty and difference in this allegation, the evangelist still swerving from the text he citeth. By the ‘thousands’ of Judah, Rabbi Solomon understandeth the ‘families,’ and Dav. Kimchi, the ‘cities.’ The word is once used in the very propriety of that sense, in which the prophet taketh it here, Judg. vi. 15; “My thousand (saith Gideon) is poor in Manasseh:”—which St. Austin and R. Isaiah expound, that he was captain of a thousand; Levi Gershom, that his father was captain; but the Chaldee, and other Rabbins, understand it of the thousand, in which his family was numbered and enrolled. Howsoever it is understood, it is apparent, by this and other places laid unto it, that the several tribes of the children of Israel were divided into their several thousands, and that these thousands were enrolled to this or that city, to which they had relation by habitation, or by inheritance: villages, that were not so populous, were reduced into hundreds; but cities into one or more thousands, according as they were in bigness and multitude. “The city that went out by a thousand, shall leave a hundred; and that which went out by a hundred, shall leave tenⁿ:” the villages were justly reputed of an inferior rank; but the cities, that afforded their thousands, were accounted princes: and so may the prophet be understood, and so the evangelist reconciled to him. Now the reason of their difference in words, though they both redound to the same sense, may be given these:—

First, Because the question in agitation was about the

ⁿ Amos, v. 3.

birth of a king, and the place where; now, in answer to such a query, it was fitter to speak of princes than thousands; for where should a king be looked for, but among princes?

Secondly, The Hebrew word אלפי, used by the prophet, doth signify, both ‘thousands’ and ‘princes,’ indifferently; and so David Kimchi, upon that place in the Book of Judges, cited even now, allegeth; “There are (saith he) that interpret Alphi [which our English readeth, *my thousand*], as it were my father, even as the word Alluph, whose signification is prince, or lord.”

The evangelist, therefore, finding the word in the prophet of this indifferency, useth it in that sense, which best suited with the present occasion, both in regard of the question proposed:—as, also,

Thirdly, In regard of the manner of Christ’s coming: for it was both the expectation of the Jews, and the fear of Herod, that he would come with a conquering and victorious temporal sword, and restore them to a pompous earthly state, and expel him out of his kingdom. Now, for the evangelist to have directed, in this quotation, to look for Christ among the thousands of Judah, had backed these opinions; for the term soundeth of war, and it had been a direction where likelier to find an earthly warrior, than the Prince of peace, among the thousands, or among the militia. And, therefore, he qualifieth the term to the best satisfaction of Herod and the people; “Among the princes.” There is that saith it might be construed, “*In* princes,” and not *among* them,—and the meaning to be this, “Thou, Beth-lehem, art not the least in the princes of Juda;” that is, in breeding or bringing them forth: but this relisheth more of wit than solidity, and agreeth better with the Latin, than with the Greek original.

§ “*For out of thee shall come a Governor.*”

The Chaldee readeth it in the prophet, “Out of thee shall come *Messias*;” and so is it expounded by Rabbi Solomon, and David Kimchi: and therefore that is most true, which is inferred by Lyranus, that those Catholics, that interpret it of Hezekiah, do more Judaize than the Jews themselves. “Some Jews, indeed (saith Theophylact), do apply this to Zorobabel;” but (as he answereth) it is like, that Zorobabel was born in Babel, and not in Beth-lehem. And St. Matthew hath plainly taught both Jews and Gentiles to un-

derstand it in another sense. But here again doth he differ from the letter of the prophet, but cometh so near the sense, that the difference is as no difference at all.

Ver. 7 : “ *Herod privily called the wise men.*”

“Privily.”] For had the Jews heard of his pretences, they had so long been acquainted with his policy, tyranny, and ambition, they could readily have descried his mischievousness, and spoiled his bloody contrival, by better information given to the wise men.

§ “ *Inquired diligently of them the time, when the star appeared.*”

Had they taken their journey instantly upon the star’s appearing, Herod could easily have computed the time by the length of their journey : but by this his inquiry, it is apparent, that they had told him of its appearance at some good space before, which, in ver. 16, is plainly resolved to be two years, by the wise men’s own acknowledgment and resolution.

Ver. 11 : “ *Gold, and frankincense, and myrrh.*”

The mysterious application of these presents, as “ *Myrrham homini, uncto aurum,*” &c. be left to them, that delight and content themselves in such things ; the plain and easy interpretation of the matter is, that they tendered to Christ, the chiefest and choicest commodities that their country could afford : which they carried “ *in their treasures,*” as the text calleth it,—that is, in, and among, those commodities, that the men of those nations used to carry with them when they travelled,—especially when they meant to present any one to whom they went^o.

Ver. 15 : “ *Out of Egypt have I called my Son.*”

The two allegations produced here out of the Old Testament, this, and that out of Jeremiah, “ *In Rama was a voice heard,*”—are of that fulness, that they speak of two things a piece, and may very fitly be applied unto them both, and show that the one did resemble or prefigure the other : as this text of Hosea, aimeth both at the bringing of the church of Israel, in old time,—and of the head of that church, at this

^o As Gen. xxiv. 53. 1 Kings, x. 2.

time, out of Egypt. Then a Joseph nourished his father; now a Joseph doth so to his Redeemer: then was Egypt deadly to every male child that was born; now is it a place of refuge and preservation to this child.

Ver. 18: “*In Rama was there a voice heard,*” &c.

Ramah stood not far from Beth-lehem, though they were in two tribes: and the cry, that the poor parents and children made in Beth-lehem, when this matchless butchery was in hand, reached to Ramah, and was plainly heard thither. Now observe the fulness of this Scripture, as it is uttered by the prophet, and as it is applied by the evangelist. It was fulfilled in one kind, in the time of Jeremiah himself, and then was the lamentation and weeping in Ramah itself: for hither did Nebuzar-adan bring his prisoners, after he had destroyed Jerusalem, and there did he dispose of them, to the sword, or to captivity, as seemed good unto himself^p. And imagine what lamentation and crying was then in that city, when so many were doomed there, either to be slain in that place, or to go to Babel, never to see their own land again. Then was the cry in Ramah, and it was heard no doubt to Beth-lehem. But now the prophecy is fulfilled in another kind, when Herod destroyeth so many children in Beth-lehem, and in the suburbs and borders belonging to it: and now the cry is in Beth-lehem, and it is heard to Ramah.

§ “*Rachel weeping for her children,*” &c.

Rachel's grave was betwixt Beth-lehem and Ramah, or, at least, not far distant from either of them^q. The Holy Ghost, therefore, doth elegantly set forth this lamentation, by personating Rachel [who died in the birth of her Ben-oni, ‘the son of her sorrow’] sorrowing for her sons and children, that were thus massacred. And this sheweth that the text, in the prophet, aimeth, in the first place and intention, at the matter of Nebuzar-adan: for in Beth-lehem, Rachel properly had no children at all, that city being inhabited by the children of Judah, which descended of Leah: but in Ramah dwelt Rachel's children, that being a town of Ephramites, descended from Joseph. Howsoever, Rachel may be said to weep for the babes of Beth-lehem as her own children,

^p Jer. xl. 1.

^q Gen. xxxv. 16. 20. 1 Sam. x. 2.

though they were not strictly and properly her seed, in regard of the interest that she had in all the tribes of Israel, as being wife unto their father: as Joseph is often called the father of Christ, being only husband to his mother. And see such another phrase, Gen. xxxvii. 10; “Shall I, and thy mother, come to bow down before thee?” whereas Joseph’s mother was dead already.

Ver. 19: “*But when Herod was dead,*” &c.

The end of Herod was not long after the massacre of these infants; and his bloodiness,—which he had used all his life long, and topped up in the murder of these innocents, and in desire to have done as much to the Lord of life,—the Lord doth now bring upon his own head. This matter with the children of Beth-lehem, we conceive to have been some three months, more or less, before his end; in which space this was his behaviour, as may be collected out of Josephus.

He had slain, long before this, his two sons, Alexander and Aristobulus; and now was he about to do as much by his son Antipater, a child too like the father, and one whom he left, by will, the successor in his kingdom: him, suspected by him for some machination against himself, he had now shut up in prison, and intended him presently for the execution, but that his sickness, whereof he died, seizing on him, gave some more space to the imprisoned, and some hopes and possibilities of escaping. His disease was all these mixed together:—an inward burning and exulceration,—an insatiable greediness and devouring,—the colic,—the gout and dropsy,—his loins and secrets crawling with lice,—and a stink about him, not to be endured. These wringings and tortures of his body, meeting with the peevishness of old age,—for he was now seventy,—and with the natural cruelty which always had been in him, made him murderously minded above all measure: insomuch, that he put to death divers, that had taken down a golden eagle, which he had set up about the temple.—And when he grew near to his end, and saw himself ready to die, he slew his son Antipater, and caused great multitudes of the nobility and people to be closed up in a sure place, giving command to slay them, as soon as he was dead; for by that means (he said) he should have the Jews truly and really to sorrow at his death^r.

^r Vid. Joseph. Antiq. lib. 17. cap. 8—10; and de Bel. lib. 1. cap. 21.

Ver. 20: “ *For they are dead, that sought the young child’s life.*”

The like saying is to Moses, Exod. iv. 19; where the word *they* may be understood of Pharaoh and his servants, which jointly sought his life for the Egyptian’s sake, whom he had slain; and were now all dead and worn out in the forty years of his being in Midian. But here [it is true, indeed, that the seeking of the child’s life may well be applied to Herod’s servants, as well as himself], that all they died with him or about the time of his death, who, in flattery, or favour, or obedience to him, had promoted the slaughter at Beth-lehem, and had sought the child’s life,—I know not upon what ground it should be conceived.

I should, therefore, by the *they*, in this place, understand Herod and his son Antipater jointly together. For if it be well considered, how mischievous this Antipater was against his own brethren, and how he wrought their ruin and misery, for fear they should get betwixt him and the throne,—yea, how he sought the destruction of his own father, because he thought he kept him out of the throne too long,—it may very well be believed, that he would bloodily stir against this new King of the Jews, that the wise men spake of,—for fear of interception of the crown, as well as his father. He died but five days before his father’s death, as it was touched before out of Josephus; and thus God brought this bloodiness of the father and the son, and the rest of their cruelties, to an end, and upon their own heads, at once, and, in a manner, together; and thus may the words of the angel be very fairly understood, “ Take the child, and return to the land of Israel; for Herod and Antipater are dead, that sought his life.”

Ver. 22: “ *Archelaus did reign in Judea, in the room of his father Herod.*”

Herod had first named Antipater for his successor in the throne of Judea; but, upon detection of his conspiracy against him, he altered his mind and his will, and nominated Antipas: and changing his mind yet again, he named Archelaus, and he succeeded him: a man not likely to prosper in a throne, that was so bebloodied: his conclusion was, that, in the tenth year of his reign, he was accused by

the nobles of Judea and Samaria, to Augustus,—banished to Vienna,—and his estate confiscate^a.

Ver. 23 : “ *He shall be called a Nazarene.*”

From Isa. xi. 1 : where the Messiah is called by the title נֹצֵר, which indifferently signifieth ‘ a branch,’ and the city ‘ Nazareth :’ one and the same word denoting Christ, and the place where he should be born.

SECTION VIII.

Christ showeth his Wisdom at twelve Years old.

LUKE, II.

Ver. 40. “ AND the child grew^b, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom; and the grace of God was upon him.

41. Now his parents went to Jerusalem, every year^c, at the feast of the Passover.

42. And, when he was twelve years old, they went up to Jerusalem, after the custom of the feast.

43. And, when they had fulfilled the days, as they returned, the child Jesus tarried behind in Jerusalem, and Joseph and his mother knew not of it.

44. But they, supposing him to have been in the company, went a day’s journey; and they sought him among their kinsfolk and acquaintance :

45. And, when they found him not, they turned back again to Jerusalem seeking him.

46. And it came to pass, that, after three days, they found him in the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them, and asking them questions.

47. And all that heard him, were astonished at his understanding and answers.

48. And when they saw him, they were amazed : and his mother said unto him, ‘ Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? Behold, thy father and I have sought thee, sorrowing.’

49. And he said unto them, ‘ How is it, that ye sought me? Wist ye not, that I must be about my Father’s business^d?’

50. And they understood not the saying, which he spake unto them.

51. And he went down with them, and came to Naza-

^a Jos. Ant. lib. 17. cap. 15.

^b Comp. Exod. ii. 10. 1 Sam. ii. 26. Judg. xvi. 24.

^c Exod. xxiii. 15. 17.

^d Or, ‘ In my Father’s house.’

reth, and was subject unto them: but his mother kept all these sayings in her heart.

52. And Jesus increased in wisdom, and stature, and in favour with God and men."

Reason of the Order.

The order of this section, dependeth so clearly upon the proper order of that preceding, that that being made good, to lie where it doth, as in the proper place,—the subsequence of this to it, can nothing at all be doubted of. For, whereas all the evangelists have unanimously passed over, in silence, all those years of Christ's minority, which intervened or passed between his return out of Egypt, and this passage of his at twelve years old,—there is nothing possible to be found in the Gospels, that can come between, to interpose this order and connexion. The carriage and demeanour of our Saviour in the time between, is only briefly comprised in the first verse of this portion; "And the child grew and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom; and the grace of God was upon him."

HARMONY AND EXPLANATION.

Ver. 40: "*And the child grew,*" &c.

Two years old he was, when he went into Egypt: and there he abode, in his exile, a very small time,—it may be, some two or three months: about such a space as Moses had been hid in Egypt, in his father's house, from the fury of Pharaoh. When he returned to Nazareth, his mother's city, being now about two years and a quarter old, he was not weaned [if, in this, he followed the use and custom of the Jewish children, as it is like he did], but still sucked his mother's breasts: as he grew in body, he grew much more in mind; for so the phrase, "He waxed strong in spirit," seemeth to be understood by the evangelist; taking 'spirit,' not so much for 'the Holy Ghost,'—though, it is past question, he was filled with that,—as for his soul, or spiritual part of his human nature. And so he describeth his growth in both parts, in the two expressions, "The child grew in body, and waxed strong" in intellect and soul: "filled with wisdom," in an extraordinary manner above other children,—and a graciousness appeared in him, both in person and actions.

Ver. 41: “ *Now his parents went to Jerusalem,*” &c.

‘Joseph’ is called ‘the parent’ of Christ, as Paul^f calleth ‘preaching’ ‘foolishness,’ because he was so commonly reputed by men: and as for women’s going up to this festival, whereas the law required only the males’ appearance before the Lord, three times in the year,—we shall have occasion to speak of it hereafter.

Ver. 42: “ *And when he was twelve years old,*” &c.

At what age our Saviour showeth his admirable wisdom in the temple among the doctors, in this story, at the same age had Solomon showed his, in the matter of the two hostesses, about the dead and living child^g. For that he was twelve years old at that time, may be conceived upon these collections:—

First; Absalom began to rebel in the thirty-seventh year of David’s reign, or three years before his death, or thereabout; this is to be picked out of that dateless reckoning of years, 2 Sam. xv. 7: “And, after forty years, Absalom said, Let me go pay my vow,” &c. These forty years are counted from the time that Israel asked a king: three of Saul’s reign^h, and seven-and-thirty of David’s; and then began Absalom to challenge the kingdom: and the reckoning, from that date, giveth this hint and intimation,—that, as their asking a king then, did sore displease the Lord, so now are they punished in the proper kind for it, when they have so many kings, that they know not well which to follow, and many of them perish in following the usurper.

Secondly; Before his open rebellion, Absalom had been two years in Jerusalem, and not seen the king’s faceⁱ.

Thirdly; Before that time, he had been three years in deserved exile in Geshur^j.

Fourthly; And two years had passed betwixt the rape of Tamar, and slaughter of Amnon, which occasioned him into that exile^k.

So that, counting all these years together, they appear, clearly, to be ten at the least, betwixt the rape of Tamar, and David’s death: and so are they so many of Solomon’s age at the same time.

Now, that there was some good space, that passed be-

^f 1 Cor. i. 21. 23.
2 Sam. xiv. 28.

^g 1 Kings, iii. 25. 28.
^j 2 Sam. xiii. 38.

^h 1 Sam. xiii. 1.
^k 2 Sam. xiii. 23.

twixt these sums of time mentioned, as betwixt the birth of Solomon, and the rape of Tamar,—betwixt Absalom's seeing of the king's face, and his breaking out after into that rebellion,—and other spaces,—it cannot be denied, upon serious and considerate casting up of the story : but to find out the exact space and measure of time, is hardly possible ; and so is it to determine the age of our Saviour, at the time of his disputing with the doctors. For though the evangelist says, that he was twelve years old, yet hath he left it doubtful, whether current or complete : and, that it was a whole half year under or over, it cannot be denied, seeing that he was born about September,—and this his disputing was at the Passover, about March or April. So when we say, ' Solomon was twelve years old, when he began to reign, and when he determined the controversy of the two hostesses,' it is not necessary, punctually, to pick out and show that space of time to all exactness ; it sufficeth to show, that the text bringeth him near to that age, under or over¹.

Ver. 43 : “ *The child Jesus tarried behind in Jerusalem ; and Joseph and his mother knew not of it.*”

That morning, that they were to depart to their own home, it was the custom to go first to the temple, and to worship the Lord^m. Now the multitudes, that went together at these times, were exceeding great and many, all the males of the nation, and very many of the females, being constantly present at these occasions.

When, therefore, Joseph and Mary, and the Galilean company, that went along with them, departed from the temple to go their journey,—it is likely, that Christ stayed behind them in the temple-court ; where also he haunted, till they found him again. Now, he having been absent from them, and in other companies, sometimes before in the festival-week, as it can hardly be doubted,—it is not to be wondered, if they were not so punctually exact, as to be sure, to bring him with them, in their sight, out of the temple and the city. For they knew not, nor could they conceive, that he had any thing to do, or how he could stay behind them, when they were gone ; and, therefore, though they saw him not, yet doubted they not, but he was with some of his acquaintance or other, in that vast and numerous mul-

¹ See Ignat. Martyr, in Epist. ad Magnes.

^m 1 Sam. i. 19.

titude : yea, so confident they were of this, that when, after a while, they missed him, yet did they not suspect his staying behind them in Jerusalem; but went that day's journey forward, searching and inquiring for him among their kindred and acquaintance, that went along with them [for so are those words to be understood], till they came to their lodging. And by that time, not having found him, they resolve, and accordingly do, on the next morning, return for Jerusalem.

It is conceived by some, that the multitudes, going to and from these festivals, went, the men by themselves, and the women by themselves, and the children indifferently with either parent, as they thought good : and so Mary supposed that Jesus was with Joseph, and Joseph supposed that he was with Mary ; and, by this misapprehension, they went their first day's journey, till they met at their lodging, before they missed him. But if that were certain, which is very doubtful, that they thus travelled, males and females apart ;—yet it is clear by the text, that they jointly missed him in their first day's journey, and betimes in the journey, long before they came to their inn ; and yet would not return to seek him at Jerusalem, where they could not so much as suspect, that he would stay behind, when he saw all the company setting homewards ; but they still go on their journey, and inquire up and down in the company for him, till their not meeting him at night resolves them, that he was not in the company at all.

Ver. 46 : “ *After three days, they found him in the temple.*”

That is, on the third day : for one they spent in journeying homewards, though they missed him,—the other in returning that journey to Jerusalem,—and on the third day they find him in the temple, where he had slipped from them in the crowd, when they came to do their farewell worship.

§ “ *In the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors.*”

Compare Psal. lxxxii. 1. Hag. ii. 7. Mal. iii. 1, 2.

The Sanhedrim, or great bench of judges and doctors, sat in the court of the temple. This R. Solomon observeth upon the conjunction of the end of the twentieth and beginning of the one-and-twentieth chapters of Exodus : for,

whereas the twentieth ends with, “An altar of earth shalt thou make unto me,” &c. and the one-and-twentieth begins with, “And these are the judgments,”—his collection from hence is, that the judges were to sit in the sanctuary. And to the same purpose, and far more largely, speaketh Maimonidesⁿ; “The Sanhedrim (saith he) sat in the sanctuary, and their number was seventy-one, as it is said, ‘Gather me seventy men of the elders of Israel;’ and Moses was over them, as it is said, ‘And let them stand there with thee;’ behold, seventy-one. The chiefest in wisdom among them, they made head over them, and he was the head of the bench, and wise men constantly call him (נשיא) ‘Nasi,’ ‘the prince,’ and he stands instead of Moses: and him that is chief among the seventy, they appoint second to the head, and he sits on his right hand, and he is called (אב ב”ד) ‘Ab beth Din,’ or ‘The father of the court:’ and the rest of the seventy sit before them two, according to their dignity, &c. And they sit, as it were, in half the floor, in a circle, that the Nasi and the Ab beth Din may see them all. And they erected, also, two other courts of judges, of twenty-three men a piece, one by the gate of the court, and one by the gate of the mountain of the house:” that is, one at the gate of the outer court,—and another, at the gate of the inner. Now, into which of these societies our Saviour was got at this time, it is something hard to determine,—since, being in any of them, he may be said to be in the temple.

SECTION IX.

*The Ministry of John the Baptist the beginning of the Gospel.
Multitudes baptized.*

MATT. III.

Ver. 1. “IN those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea;

2. And saying, ‘Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.’

3. For this is he, that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, ‘The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.’

4. And the same John had his raiment of camel’s hair^o,

ⁿ In Sanhedr. cap. 1. 5.

^o A rough garment, the garb of a prophet; Zech. xiii. 4.

and a leathern girdle^p about his loins, and his meat was locusts^q, and wild honey^r.

5. Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan;

6. And were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins.

7. But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, ‘O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?’

8. Bring forth, therefore, fruits meet for repentance:

9. And think not to say within yourselves,—We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, That God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham.

10. And now also is the axe^s laid unto the root of the trees: therefore, every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn down, and cast into the fire.

11. I, indeed, baptize you with water, unto repentance: but he that cometh after me, is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire;

12. Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner: but will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.

MARK, I.

Ver. 1. THE beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God;

2. As it is written in the prophets, ‘Behold, I send my messengers before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee.’

3. The voice of one crying in the wilderness, ‘Prepare ye the way of the Lord; make his paths straight.’

4. John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins:

5. And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him, in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins.

6. And John was clothed with camel’s hair, and with a

^p See Elias so arrayed, 2 Kings, i. 8.

^q A clean meat, Lev. xi. 22.

^r Honey abroad in the fields; as Deut. xxxii. 13. Judg. xiv. 8. 1 Sam. xiv. 26.

^s The same word is used by the seventy, Psal. lxxiv. 5. Judg. ix. 48. 1 Sam. xiii. 20: the word כְּרֵמָה, which the Syrian hath, is used by the Chaldee Par. Job, xiv. 20. or in our English, ver. 29. [Leusden refers to chap. xxiv, of Job: but neither xxiv, nor xiv, contains twenty-nine verses.—ED.]

girdle of skin about his loins; and he did eat locusts and wild honey.

7. And preached, saying, 'There cometh one mightier than I after me, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose.

8. I, indeed, have baptized you with water; but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost.'

LUKE, III.

Ver. 1. Now in the fifteenth year of Tiberius^t Cæsar, Pontius^u Pilate^v being governor of Judea, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of Iturea and of the region of Trachonitis, and Lysanias the tetrarch of Abilene,

2. Annas^w and Caiaphas being the high-priests; the word of God came unto John, the son of Zacharias, in the wilderness.

3. And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance, for the remission of sins:

4. As it is written in the book of the words of Esaias the prophet, saying, 'The voice of one crying^x in the wilderness,—Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.

5. Every valley shall be filled, and every mountain and hill shall be brought low, and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough ways shall be made smooth:

6. And all flesh shall see the salvation of God.'

7. Then said he to the multitude that came forth to be baptized of him, 'O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?

8. Bring forth, therefore, fruits worthy of repentance: and begin not to say within yourselves,—We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, That God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.

9. And now also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees; every tree, therefore, which bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn down, and cast into the fire.'

^t Called 'Claudius Tiberius Nero,' and, for his viciousness and intemperance, 'Claudius Biberius Mero;' Suet. in Tib. cap. 42.

^u Pontius was a common prænomen among the Romans; as Pontius Nigrinus, Dion. lib. 58: Pontius Fregellanus, Tac. An. lib. 6: and Pontia, id. ib. lib. 13; derived, belike, from *ponte*.

^v From *pilum*, a Roman weapon; or *pila*, a pillar. ^w In Josephus, called Ananus.

^x Not Christ the crier, and John his voice, as some would understand it; but John the crier,—and his voice, his preaching.

10. And the people asked him, saying, ‘What shall we do then?’

11. He answereth, and saith unto them, ‘He that hath two coats^y, let him impart to him that hath none; and he that hath meat, let him do likewise.’

12. Then came also publicans to be baptized, and said unto him, ‘Master, what shall we do?’

13. And he said unto them, ‘Exact no more than that which is appointed you.’

14. And the soldiers likewise demanded of him, saying, ‘And what shall we do?’ And he said unto them, ‘Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely^z, and be content with your wages^a.’

15. And as the people were in expectation, and all men mused in their hearts of John, whether he were the Christ, or not;

16. John answered, saying unto them all, ‘I, indeed, baptize you with water; but one mightier than I cometh, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire:

17. Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and will gather the wheat into his garner; but the chaff he will burn with fire unquenchable.’

18. And many other things in his exhortation preached he unto the people.

Reason of the Order.

Although there be a very large space of time betwixt the section last preceding, and the beginning of this,—yet, because the reader in his Bible can see nothing mentioned in

^y Χιτῶν, or, Ionice, κιθῶν, from the Hebr. כִּתְוֹן. It properly signifieth the upper garment, as in the Seventy, Gen. xxxvii. 3; Matt. v. 40.—Athen. Deipnos. lib. 1; Tellias gave to five hundred horsemen, χιτῶνα καὶ ἱμάτιον, A coat and a suit.

^z Συκοφαντήσητε. Ister in ‘Atticis,’ saith, “It is not lawful to carry figs out of Attica, which grew there, because the inhabitants may enjoy them themselves: and whereas many were found out, that stole them forth of the country, those that detected any such to the magistrates, were, at first, called sycophants:” Athen. Deipn. lib. 3. At the first, the honestest and best men of repute, were appointed to be overseers in this matter about transportation; but in time, the office being abused, the name came into utter disgrace; idem ibid.: and so, a sycophant was no better than a common barretor. “This is the custom of sycophants, that they themselves will begin to speak evil of a man, and to utter something against him as in secret; that another, hearing so much, may also be induced to speak the like, and so become liable to be accused: for this they do without danger, because they do it upon a plot,” &c. Dion. Cass. lib. 58.

^a The Greek here useth a Latin word, ‘opsonium,’ as being spoken to the Roman soldiers, and a word with which they were best acquainted. “Caius panaria cum opsonio viritim dedit;” Sueton. in Caio, cap. 18. Used again, Rom. vi. 23.

any of the Four that may come between, he will easily satisfy himself without any farther discourse, that the order is necessary, and the connexion undeniable. But, it may be, he may wonder, why the evangelists have passed so much time in silence, without any mention at all of our Saviour Christ, or of any thing done or spoken by him : but when he shall observe, in the very first words of this section, that the preaching of John, and his baptism, was the beginning of the gospel, then will he see, that they hasten to that, and forward, as to the main aim and chief intention of their writing ; but that the conception and birth of Christ, and his forerunner, were necessarily to be related before.

In these *collateral*^a columns of the text, and forward, where we shall have occasion to use them so, the reader's eye must sometimes help to lay them together, where the pen could not, without changing and transposing the natural method of the text ; as in this section now in hand, it had been both as easy for me to have written the third verse of Mark, after the fourth and fifth, as before them, and more agreeing to the columns on either side it ; but that I would not be so bold as to change verses without any reason, which Mark, not without good reason, did dispose as they lie. And this cautiousness have I observed all along as I go, where occasion is offered ; presuming rather to trouble the reader to rank them with his eye, than to tear the text in the whole cloth, and then sew it together at other edges. It will sometimes be inevitable, but that we must invert and alter the order of one evangelist or other, from what he had laid it ; but where-soever that shall be so, there shall be such a reason given for it, as, I hope, shall be to the reader's satisfaction, and mine own excuse.

HARMONY AND EXPLANATION.

Mark, i. 1 : “ *The beginning of the gospel.* ”

This is the beginning of that age of the world, which the prophets so unanimously pointed out for the time of good things to come ; and which they expressed, sometimes, by the term of ‘ the last days^b ;’ sometimes, of ‘ the acceptable year of the Lord^c ;’ sometimes, of ‘ the kingdom of

^a The narrowness of an octavo-page does not admit of arranging *three* columns in collateral position.—ED.

^b Isa. ii. 2. Micah, iv. 1. Joel, ii. 28.

^c Isa. lxi. 2.

God^d;’ and sometimes, of ‘a new heaven, and a new earth^e:’ and which the gospel itself doth begin, from the beginning of the ministry and preaching of John the Baptist; as in this verse, and Matt. xi. 12; Acts i. 22, and x. 37. So that, though, in our chronicle account and computation, we begin to reckon from the birth of our Saviour, the second Adam,—as the age of the world before, was reckoned from the creation of the first; yet, in strict and exact computing, the new world, as one may call it, or the age of the gospel, began not before the setting forth of John to preach and baptize; and this his ministry is most fitly called the ‘beginning of the gospel,’ both in regard of his preaching and of his baptizing.

For, first, The doctrine and preaching of John, was of a differing strain and diverse tenor from the literal doctrine of the law: for *that* called all for works, and for exact performance,—“Do this, and live;” and, “He, that doeth not all the words of this law, is cursed.”—But John called for repentance, and for renewing of the mind, and for belief in him that was coming after,—disclaiming all righteousness by the works and performance of the law, but proclaiming repentance for non-performance, and righteousness only to be had by Christ. So that here were new heavens, and a new earth, begun to be created; a new commandment given; a new church founded; justification by the works of the law cried down; and, the glorious doctrine of repentance and faith set up.

Secondly; Whereas baptism was used before among the Jews, only for admission of proselytes or heathens to their church and religion^f; now it is published and proposed to the Jews themselves to be received and undergone, showing unto them; 1. That they were now to be entered and transplanted into a new profession; and, 2. That the Gentiles and they were now to be knit into one church and body.

The ministry of John being of so high concernment, as being thus ‘the beginning of the gospel,’ and of a new world,—it is no wonder, that St. Luke doth so exactly point out the year, by the reign of the emperor, the rule of Pilate, Herod, Philip, and Lysanias, the high-priesthood of Annas

^d Dan. ii. 44, and vii. 14.^e Isa. lxxv. 17.^f As Vid. Aben Ezra, Gen. xxxv. Rambam in Issure Biah, cap. 13.

and Caiaphas, that so remarkable a year might be fixed and known to all the world : and that the condition and the state of the times might be observed, when the gospel began. And here it might have been proper to have begun the second part of this our task, and not to have driven over this period of time, and to stop half a year after it, at the baptism of our Saviour ; but, since his preaching and appearing to the world, is the great and main thing that the evangelists look after,—and since the preaching of the Baptist was but a preface and forerunner unto that of his,—it is not improper, and may be very excusable, to make that our entrance to another part, and take this with us in our motion, to our lodging and resting there.

§ “ *Of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.*”

This title of ‘The Son of God,’ is proclaimed of Christ from heaven, at his baptism, when he is to begin to preach the gospel,—as it is said here to be ‘the gospel of the Son of God.’ And it was necessary, that so much should be intimated and learned concerning him, as the author of the gospel ; because, 1. The gospel was the full revealing and opening of the will of the Father. 2. The overthrow and ruin of the rites and ceremonies of Moses. 3. The admission of heathen and strangers to be the church and people of the Lord ; whereas, Israel had been his peculiar before. 4. It was a doctrine of trusting in another, and not one’s-self, for salvation : and who was fit for doing the three former, or for being the object of the latter, but “Jesus Christ, the Son of God ?” who, coming from the bosom of the Father, and being the substance and body of those shadows and ceremonies, might raze that partition-wall, which, in the giving of the law, himself had reared ; and did not only preach the doctrine of the gospel, but also fully perform the law.

Ver. 2 : “ *As it is written in the prophets.*”

It seemeth by the Syrian, Arabic, Vulgar Latin, Victor Antiochenus, Origen cited by him, and others,—that some copies read, “As it is written in Isaiah the prophet :” and Jansenius thinketh, it was so written by Mark himself, but purposely changed by the doctors of the church, as we read it now, to avoid the difficulty, which the other reading carried with it.

But, first, it were a very strange and impious, though an easy, way of resolving doubts, to add to, or diminish from, the text, at pleasure, as the text shall seem easy or difficult. This is not to expound the Bible, but to make a new one, or a text, of one's own head.

Secondly ; In ancients times than any of theirs that are produced, which read, "In Isaiah the prophet,"—it was read, as we do, "In the prophets ;" as Jansenius himself sheweth, out of Irenæus^g.

Thirdly ; The one half of the words alleged in the text, are not in Isaiah at all, but in Malachi ; and the first half also,—for that is considerable. For, though sometimes the New Testament, in allegations from the Old, doth closely couch two several places together under one quotation, as if they were but one ; yet it maketh it sure, that the first always is that very place, which it takes on it to cite, though the second be another. As, Acts vii. 7, Stephen allegeth a speech of God, as if uttered to Abraham alone ; whereas, it is two several quotations, and two several speeches, tied up in one ; the one spoken to Abraham, indeed,—but the other, to Moses, almost four hundred years after ; and that to Abraham is set the first, for he is the subject, whereupon the allegation is produced.

Fourthly ; It is a manner of speech not used in the New Testament, to say, 'it is written,' or, 'it is said *in* such or such a prophet,' but, *by* him. We find, indeed, "It is written in the law^h;" and, "It is written in the Book of Psalmsⁱ;" yea, "It is written in the prophets^j;" but no where that it is written in a single prophet.

Fifthly ; To read as we do, "As it is written in the prophets," agreeth with the ordinary and usual division of the Old Testament, by the Hebrews, into "Oraietha^k, Nebhyim^l, Chetubhim^m;" "The law, the prophets, and the holy writs:" approved and followed by our Saviour, Luke xxiv. 44 ; and alluded to by the evangelist here.

"Before thy face, &c. Thy way before thee."] The former is neither in the Hebrew, nor in the LXX, at all ; the latter is in them both, but clean contrary,—for they both have it, 'The way before *me*.'

But, first, The evangelists and apostles, when they take

^g Lib. 3. cap. 11. ^h Luke, x. 26. ⁱ Acts, i. 20. ^j John, vi. 45.
^k אוריתא. ^l נביאים ^m כתובים

on them to cite any text from the Old Testament, are not so punctual to observe the exact and strict form of words, as the pith of them, or sense of the place, as might be instanced in many particulars; so that the difference of the words would not prejudice the agreement in sense, were there not so flat difference of person as *me* and *thee*.

Secondly; The majesty of Scripture doth often show itself, in requoting of places, in this,—that it allegeth them in difference of words and difference of sense; yea, sometimes in contrariety,—not to make one place to cross or deny another; but, by the variety, one to explain and illustrate another, as in corresponding places in the Old Testament, might be showed at large: as Gen. x. 22, 23, cited 1 Chron. i. 17: Gen. xxxvi. 12, compared with 1 Chron. i. 36: 1 Sam. xxv. 44, paralleled 2 Sam. xxi. 8: 2 Chron. iii. 15, with Jer. lii. 21; and very many other places of the like nature, wherein the Holy Ghost, having penned a thing in one place, doth, by variety of words and sense, enlarge and expound himself in another. And the same divine authority and majesty doth he also use in the New Testament, both in parallel places in itself, and in citations in it from the Old. So that this difference in hand, betwixt ‘*my* face,’ in Malachi, and ‘*thy* face,’ in Mark, is not contradictory, or crossing one another, but explicatory, or one explaining another; and both together do result to the greater mystery. For, Christ is the *face*, or presence of the Father: and so is he plainly called, Exod. xxxiii. 14: and in Christ, the Father came and revealed himself among men: and the words, in both places, both in the prophet, and in the evangelist, are to be taken for the words of the Father; in the one, spoken *of* the Son,—and in the other, *to* him. In Malachi, thus, “Behold, I send my messenger before me, to prepare the way before *my* face;” that is, ‘before the Son,’ as he is in his own nature, the very brightness of the glory of the Father, and the express image of his person^m: and, in Mark, thus, “To prepare the way before *thy* face;” that is, ‘before thee, O Son, when thou comest to undertake the work of redemption, and to publish the gospel.’ And this change of persons, in grammatical construction, is usual in the Hebrews’ eloquence and rhetoric; as, “My heart rejoiceth in the Lord, I rejoice in thy salvation; there is none

^m Heb. i. 3.

holy as the Lord, for there is none beside theeⁿ," &c. " They shall look upon *me*, whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for *him*^o:" and, " The Lord *my* God shall come, and all the saints with *thee*^p."

Luke, iii. 1 : " *In the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar.*"

This Tiberius was the third emperor of the Romans, the son of Livia, the wife of Augustus, and by him adopted into the family of the Cæsars, and to the empire. A man of such subtilty, cruelty, avarice, and bestiality, that for all, or, indeed, for any, of these, few stories can show his parallel: and as if, in this very beginning of the gospel, he were produced of such a constitution, to teach us what to look for from that cruel and abominable city, in all ages and successions.

Now, Tiberius's fifteenth, was the year of the world 3957; and the time of the year that John began to baptize in it, was about Easter, or the vernal equinox, as may be concluded from the time of the baptism of our Saviour. For, if Jesus were baptized in Tisri, or September, as is cleared hereafter, he being then but just entering upon his thirtieth year, as the law required^a: and if John,—being six months elder than our Saviour, as it is plain he was,—did enter his ministry at the very same age, according to the same law,—it readily follows, that the time mentioned, was the time when he began to preach. It was, indeed, Tiberius's fifteenth, when John began to baptize; but it may very well be questioned, whether it were so, when our Saviour was baptized by him. For the exact beginning of every year of Tiberius's reign, was from the fourteenth of the calends of September, or the eighteenth of August, at what time Augustus died^r. That fifteenth of the emperor, therefore, in the spring time of which John began to baptize, was expired before September, when our Saviour was baptized; and so his baptism is to be reputed in the year of the world 3958, which was then but newly begun, and in the sixteenth year of Tiberius, but newly begun neither, unless you will reckon the year of the emperor, as the Romans did the year of the consuls, from January to January. But this we will not controvert, nor cross the common and constant opinion of all

^a 1 Sam. ii. 1, 2.

^o Zech. xii. 10.

^p Zech. xiv. 5.

^q Num. iv.

^r Sueton. in Aug. cap. 100.

times, that holdeth our Saviour to have been baptized in Tiberius's fifteenth.

§ “*Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea.*”

He is called ‘Procurator Judeæ,’ by Tacitus^s; and hath this brand set upon him by Egesippus^t, that he was “Vir nequam, et parvi faciens mendacium;” “A wicked man, and one that made little conscience of a lie:” from which unconscionable disposition, those words of his^u, “What is truth,”—seem to proceed, in scorn of truth, and derision of it. He succeeded Gratus in the government of Judea; managed it with a great deal of troublesomeness and vexation to the nation; and, at last, was put out of his rule by Vitellius, and sent to Rome, to answer for his misdemeanours^v.

§ “*Herod being tetrarch of Galilee.*”

This was Antipas, the son of Herod the Great, and called also ‘Herod,’ after his father; a man, that, after a long and wicked misdemeanour, in his place, was at last banished by Caius,—upon the accusation of his nephew, Herod Agrippa, and Herodias, his incestuous mate, with him,—as shall be showed in a more proper place.

§ “*Tetrarch.*”

Some, tying themselves too strictly to the signification of the Greek word, understand by ‘tetrarch,’ him that governeth the fourth part of a kingdom; for the original word includeth four; and, accordingly, have concluded, that the kingdom of Herod the Great was divided by Augustus, after his death, into four parts, and given to his four sons,—Arche-laüs [in whose room, they say, succeeded Pontius Pilate], Herod Antipas, Philip, and Lysanias. In this strictness hath the Syrian translator taken the word, rendering it thus; “Herod being the fourth ruler of Galilee, and Philip the fourth ruler in Iturea:” and the Arabic thus; “Herod being head over a fourth part, even Galilee;” and so in the rest. But if the opinion be narrowly examined, these absurdities will be found in it:—

First; It maketh a tetrarchy to be nothing else, but exactly the fourth part of a kingdom; whereas, Pliny^w speaketh

^s Annal. lib. 15.

^t De excid. Jerus. l. 2. c. 5.

^u John, xviii. 38.

^v Joseph. Antiq. lib. 18. c. 3—5. Philo in Legatione.

^w Lib. 5. cap. 18.

of tetrarchies, that were like kingdoms, and compacted into kingdoms; and he nameth 'Trachonitis' for one. His words are these; "Intercurrent, cinguntque has urbes tetrarchiæ, regnorum instar, singulæ, et in regna contribuuntur, Trachonitis, Paneas, in qua Cæsarea cum supradicto fonte, Abila." And^w he saith, "Cœlosyria had seventeen tetrarchies;" "Tetrarchias in regna descriptas, barbaris nominibus decem et septem."

Secondly; It divideth Herod's kingdom into four parts, whereas it was parted only into three, to his three sons^x.

Thirdly; It maketh Lysanias to be Herod's son; which he was not at all.

A tetrarch, therefore, seemeth rather to be one, that was in the fourth rank or degree of excellency and government in the Roman empire: the emperor, that was lord of all the empire, being the first,—the proconsul, that governed a province, the second,—a king, the third,—and a tetrarch, the fourth. So מִשְׁנֵה and שְׁלִישׁ in the Hebrew, signify a man, second or third to the king.

§ "And his brother Philip being tetrarch," &c.

"Herod made Antipas [whom he had intended for king, but, changing his mind, he changed his last will] tetrarch of Galilee and Peræa. And the kingdom he bestowed on Archelaus: and Gaulonitis, and Trachonitis, and Batanæa, and Paneas, he bestowed on Philip, who was his own son, and own brother to Archelaus, to be a tetrarchy^y."

§ "Of Iturea."

This country seemeth to have taken its denomination from Jetur, one of the sons of Ishmael^z; and it lay edging upon Arabia^a, but reckoned to Syria^b, and, upon that reference, mentioned by the evangelist here. For he speaketh of these countries and tetrarchies, because Syria and Judea were but one province, and under one proconsul. And, therefore, as he nameth the government of Canaan, in the two countries of Judea and Galilee, so doth he also the government of Syria, under three,—Iturea, Trachonitis, and Abilene. And this is agreeable to what he had done in chap. ii. 1, when he spake of the time of our Saviour's birth: for as he there dateth the tax that then was, by the time of a governor of Syria,—

^w In cap. 23.

^z Gen. xxv. 15.

^x Joseph. Ant. lib. 17.

^a Strab. lib. 16.

^y Joseph. Ant. l. 17. c. 10.

^b Plin. lib. 5. cap. 23.

so doth he now the beginning of the gospel, by the time of the rulers there, as well as in Judea. And this was also most suitable to the Roman records; where, seeing that Syria and Judea were joined together into one province, it is not to be doubted, but their governors were named together, as members of one body.

§ “*And the region of Trachonitis.*”

The name of this country, as it seemeth by Strabo^c, was taken from two mountains, or rocks, called ‘Trachones:’ and they, very probably, so called from the Hebrew word, *טרה*, which signifieth ‘wearisomeness,’ in regard of the irksome and tedious difficulty of passing over them: as Strabo, instantly after them, speaketh of other mountains, towards Arabia and Iturea, which he titleth *ὄρη δύσβατα*, ‘hills hard to travel over.’ Josephus^d supposeth Uz, the eldest son of Aram, to have been the first inhabiter of this country; but whether it were that son of his or no, it is not so material to inquire, as it is to observe, that it was reputed a country belonging to Aram, or within the compass of Syria: very thievish in the time of Herod, and the inhabitants living upon the robbery of the Damascens, that lay near unto them^e.

§ “*Lysanias.*”

He was not a son of Herod, as is supposed by some,—nor an immediate son of Ptolemy Mennæus, neither, as is held by others. For though Josephus^f telleth, that Lysanias succeeded his father Ptolemy Mennæus, yet it cannot be the same man possibly, that St. Luke here speaketh of; for that Lysanias was slain by the means of Cleopatra, a good space of time before our Saviour was born^g. But the Lysanias, here mentioned, might be the great grandchild of Mennæus, or some one of that house, that bare the same name with Mennæus, his immediate son and successor.

§ “*Abilene.*”

This country was so named, from the city Abila, which Ptolemy^h hath reckoned for a city of Cœlosyria [or, as some copies have it, of Decapolis], and with this title,

^c Strab. ubi supra. Plin. lib. 5. cap. 18.

^d Antiq. lib. 1. cap. 7.

^e Joseph. Antiq. lib. 15. cap. 13.

^f Antiq. lib. 14. cap. 3, and de Bel. lib. 1. cap. 11.

^g Jos. Antiq. lib. 15. cap. 4.

^h Lib. 5. cap. 15.

"Αβιλα ἐπικληθεῖσα Λυσανίου, " Abila, surnamed from Lysanias : " see also Pliny, lib. 5. cap. 18. This word soundeth so near to the word ' Havilah,' Gen. ii. 11, and x. 7, that it may very well be supposed to have descended from it, and the name of the place from that son of Cush, that planted, with his brethren mentioned with him, in Arabia and thereabouts.

Ver. 2: "*Annas and Caiaphas being the high-priests.*"

There could be but one high-priest, properly so called, at one time ; and that Caiaphas was he at this time, it is most clear, both out of Josephus, and out of the Scripture. Now Annas is said to be high-priest with him, because he was the Nasi, or head of the Sanhedrim, and so represented Moses, as Caiaphas did Aaron ; and he was of the seed of the priests, as well as Caiaphas was. An evidence of his being the head of the great council, is, in that when our Saviour was apprehended, he was first led to Annasⁱ, and by him bound and sent to Caiaphas^j ; and that Annas is first placed in the council^k. We shall have more punctual occasion hereafter to look after this man ; and then will we see, what we can find spoken of him by Josephus.

§ "*The word of the Lord came to John.*"

Such was the commission of the prophets^l ; and this proclaimeth John a prophet, as well as they. And here had he his warrant for his ministry, and this was the institution of the sacrament of baptism. Now, whether the word of the Lord, that came to John and to the prophets, be to be understood of his personal and substantial Word^m, or of the word of prophecy, suggested to them by the Holy Ghost ; and whether John had this word imparted to him, by vision, or dream, or rapture, or what other way, it is not so material to inquire, as it is difficult to resolve :—only this is not impertinent to observe, That whereas the race of the prophets that were sent to teach and to preach to the people by the word of the Lord, was expired and extinguished long ago, in the death of Malachi, the last of that race,—there is now another race of such preachers to be raised again ; viz. John, and the great Prophet, and the apostles ; and this is the en-

ⁱ John, xviii. 13.

^j Ver. 24.

^k Acts, iv. 6.

^l As Jer. i. 2. Ezek. vi. 1, &c.

^m As John, i. 1.

trance or beginning to that glorious generation. For we are to distinguish, betwixt having the gift and spirit of prophecy, and betwixt being sent by that spirit for a constant preacher to the people. Deborah and Barak, and Huldah, and Hannah, and divers others, both men and women, had the spirit of prophecy upon them, but never had warrant to go and preach, and to be constant ministers to the church. But Isaiah, and Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, and the rest of that form, under the Old Testament, and John and the apostles under the New, had not only the spirit of prophecy upon them, to foretell things to come,—but they had also the “word of the Lord came unto them,” which gave them commission to be continual preachers, and entered them into the function of a constant ministry. As see how the Baptistⁿ himself explaineth, what is meant by this ‘word of the Lord’ coming to him,—“He sent me to baptize.”

§ “*To John, the son of Zacharias, in the wilderness.*”

The children^o of the priests, when they came to age, were to be installed and enrolled into the service of the temple; their names being entered there, and the name of their father. To this custom the evangelist seemeth to refer, when he calleth John “the son of Zacharias,” in this place, and at this time, when he was to enter upon his ministerial function: which though he did not at the temple, as others used to do, but had another kind of employment laid upon him, by “the word of the Lord coming to him” in the wilderness, in the place of his converse; yet, as, had he been there, he must have been enrolled and registered thus, “John, the son of Zacharias, began his ministration at such a time,” or to this purpose,—so doth the Holy Ghost enrol him here, at his entrance into this his ministry of another kind, “The word of the Lord came to John, the son of Zacharias.” And the like passage we may observe in the same evangelist concerning our Saviour at his being baptized, and when he also entered upon his function.

Matt. iii. 1: “*Preaching in the wilderness of Judea.*”

That is, in the cities and towns in the wilderness, as Josh. xv. 61, 62; and 1 Sam. xxiii. 14. 24: some of which were probably within the territories, and under the command

ⁿ John, i. 33.

^o Vid. Suid. in voce *ἱερούς*.

of Hebron, the place where John was born: for there is mention of the cities of Hebron, 2 Sam. ii. 3.

Mark, i. 4: “ *John did baptize in the wilderness.*”

It is the most likely, that John began to preach in the place where he was born, and from thence went to other places, as he saw occasion, and the Spirit moved him. And, indeed, Hebron itself was, in a manner, a city of the wilderness, as well as the others mentioned, though there be no such expression concerning it, as is of them: and if those words^p, “ He was in the deserts, till the day of his showing unto Israel,” were interpreted concerning his being in Hebron,—the interpretation might very well be justified; though, to avoid cavil and offence, we have expounded it of places, which the Scripture calleth ‘ deserts’ or ‘ wildernesses,’ in express terms.

However, be it in Hebron or out of Hebron, that John was educated, conversed, and began to preach; certain it is, that he did the last of these in some cities of the wilderness, not far from Hebron: and if it be said, that he baptized also in these cities, where he preached, and as yet was not gone down to Jordan, till Jerusalem and all Judea heard of him, and came to be baptized, and then he went thither for the convenience of water;—I suppose it crosseth nothing, either in the history or mystery, and it averreth no more concerning John now, than we shall find him doing hereafter; namely, baptizing in other waters besides Jordan. And, indeed, how can it rationally be understood otherwise, than that John baptized first in these cities and towns, before multitude of company drew him down unto the river?

For, first, it cannot be conceived that he walked or stood in the open fields near Jordan, and there began to preach; but that he betook himself to towns or cities, where was concourse of people.

Secondly, It can as little be conceived, that when any people in this or that city embraced his doctrine, and desired to be baptized, that he should bring them to the river, which was sometime far off, or delay them till all the multitude should meet him there together; unless it could be showed, that the water of Jordan was only allowed to be

^p Luke, i. 80.

baptized in, and no other; the contrary to which we shall see anon.

The story, therefore, and progress of his ministry and baptizing, out of the three evangelists may be compiled thus:—That first he came preaching in the wilderness of Judea, in the towns and cities that were there, about the place of his education; that he baptized there those, that were converted by his preaching, and that desired to be baptized by him; that he went abroad from thence, up and down all the country round about Jordan; and when his converts, and the concourse, were now grown numerous, he baptized them in Jordan, because there was water enough¹.

§ “*And preach the baptism of repentance.*”

The evangelist useth this title, or epithet, in opposition to circumcision, and baptizing of proselytes, which had been the way and door of admission into the church before. They might very fitly be called ‘the circumcision and baptism of performance,’ as this ‘the baptism of repentance.’ For whosoever received circumcision, was engaged by it to the performance of the whole law^r; and the like was every proselyte engaged, that received baptism. But this baptism of John, or the baptism in the Christian church, is clean of another nature. For whereas those two challenged of every one, that went through those doors into the church, that they should stand debtors to the whole law, and be obliged to a legal righteousness; our baptism requireth a clean contrary thing,—namely, that we should be obliged to repentance, in regard that the performance of the law is a thing that is to us impossible, and that we should be buried with Christ in his death, and seek after his righteousness, seeing that we have none of our own. Hence appeareth clearly, first, a reason why the baptism of John is called ‘the beginning of the gospel;’ for it opened a door, and gave an inlet, into the church upon other terms, than had ever been before. And, secondly, that baptism belongeth to children, though it be ‘the baptism of repentance,’ and they know not what repentance means: for it requireth not their repentance at their receiving of the sacrament, when they stand but in the door or entry of the church; but it engageth them to repentance for the time to come, or when they,

¹ As John, iii. 23.

^r Gal. v. 3.

being now entered into the church, shall come to the use of reason, and knowledge of the engagement.—And so was it with the children that were circumcised : for they, when they underwent that sacrament, undertook obedience to the whole law, and yet they knew not what either obedience, or the law, meant : but that undertaking was, what they were to do, when they came to the years of knowledge and apprehension.

Matt. iii. 2 : “ *And saying, ‘ Repent ye ; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.’ ”*

The phrase, ‘ The kingdom of heaven,’ which is so frequently and commonly used in the gospel, is taken from Dan. ii. 44, and vii. 14 : and it meaneth, the spiritual kingdom of Christ in, and under, the gospel, as it is published and preached unto all nations. For though the phrase be generally and truly understood to mean the preaching of the gospel ;—yet doth it, most properly and naturally, signify the preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles, or among all nations ; as might be showed by the signification of the word ‘ heaven ;’ by the manner of speech here used, ‘ that it is at hand ;’ and so again, Matt. iv. 17, when the gospel was now preached already ; by the text of Daniel, from whence the phrase is taken, and by divers places in the gospel, where it is used : but the full clearing of this, I have chosen to refer to that difficult place, which will call for it to be cleared, when the Lord shall bring us thither, Matt. xvi. 19, “ To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven ;” where I conceive Christ to have foretold to Peter, that he should be the first that should preach the gospel, and open the door of faith, unto the Gentiles ; as Acts, xv. 7. 10.

Now, ‘ the kingdom of heaven’ signifying thus, not barely and simply the preaching of the gospel, but the preaching of it to the Gentiles, and their conversion,—it sheweth how proper and pregnant an argument this was, to enforce the doctrine and practice of repentance upon the Jews, because the calling of the Gentiles was near at hand, which would prove their rejection and casting off, if they did not repent ; as Deut. xxxii. 21.

Before the coming of Christ, these four earthly kingdoms, that are mentioned by Daniel in the chapters cited, bare all the sway, and domineered over all the world, with

cruelty and tyranny : but when they were destroyed at his coming, he set up a kingdom of his own, and swayed the sceptre of righteousness over all nations, and ruled them with his word and spirit. And whereas before his coming, also, the church consisted but of one nation and kingdom, and was couched upon a small parcel of earth, the land of Canaan, and had earthly promises, and earthly rites ;—when he came and published the gospel, he gathered a church of all kingdoms, and nations, and languages, under heaven ; and built it up with heavenly and spiritual promises and instructions : and thus ‘ the kingdom of heaven ’ may fitly be understood in opposition to these two earthly ones.

Luke, iii. 5 : “ *Every valley shall be filled,*” &c.

These borrowed phrases intend the removing of obstacles and stumbling-blocks out of the way, and plaining and clearing the way for men to come to Christ, and to the obedience of the gospel. The Jews conceive, that the cloud of glory, that led the people of Israel in the wilderness, did, really and according to the letter, do what is here spoken of, for facilitating of their march and journey : as, that it levelled mountains, raised valleys, and laid all of a flat ; that it burnt up bushes and smothered rocks ; and made all plain, that they might travel without trouble or offence.

And some of them also say, that when Jeroboam set up his golden calves and idolatry in Beth-el and Dan, that he and his wicked agents laid ambushments and scouts in the ways to Jerusalem, to catch up every one that should go thither to worship ; and to this purpose they apply that saying of the prophet^s, “ O ye priests, and O ye house of the king, ye have been a snare on Mizpah, and a net upon Tabor, and the revolvers are profound to make slaughter,” &c. If either of these things were undoubtedly so, as they suppose, how properly might this passage of the prophet Isaiah, and of the evangelist from him, be thought to refer thereunto : but since they be but surmisals, it is safest to take the words for a borrowed speech, to express what was said before, the removing of obstacles in the way to Christ.

Matt. iii. 6 : “ *Confessing their sins.*”

Not to John, but to God : for neither was it possible for

John to hear their confessions, nor was it necessary :—not possible ; because of the vast multitudes that came to be baptized : nor necessary ; for to tell him they had committed such and such sins, what conduced it either to their baptism or forgiveness ?

Nor was this their confession of their sins, before their being baptized, but after : for, first, if we should strictly take the grammatical construction of the word, that importeth their confessing, it is not *ὁμολογησάμενοι*, which would have denoted that they *had* confessed before they were baptized ; but it is *ὁμολογούμενοι*, in both the evangelists, that speak of that matter.

Secondly, It was far more agreeable to the end and doctrine of baptism, that their confession of sin should be after their baptizing than before, in that they were baptized to repentance [ver. 11], and not ‘e contra ;’ the sacrament was more intentionally to enter them into repentance, than repentance to enter them into the sacrament ;—for, as was said before, it obliged them more properly to repentance, after the receiving of it than before.

Thirdly, The gesture of our Saviour, after his baptism, seemeth to have been according to the common custom and gesture of the people ; and as he, coming out of the water, fell to prayer, so they, when they came out, used to do, to make their penitent confession to the Lord.

Matt. iii. 7 : “*When he saw many of the Pharisees, and Sadducees, coming to his baptism.*”

The Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes, the three sects of the Jews^t, are those three shepherds, spoken of Zech. xi. 8 ; whom our Saviour, at his coming, was to cut off.

The two former, whom we have now in hand, are very frequent in mention in the gospel : men of enmity one against another, yet both joint enemies to Christ and to his apostles.

The original of the Pharisees is not so easy to go back unto, as that of the Sadducees ; nor is the significancy of their name so readily determined and fixed upon as the other. The Sadducees, it is well known, were so called from Sadoc, the first author of their sect, and he the scholar of Antigonus ; Rabbi Nathan^u hath thus clearly given us their original^v :—

^t Josephus Antiq. lib. 13. c. 9.

^u In his Aboth, cap. 5.

^v Vid. Talm. Bab. Basileæ, tom. 6. in fine.

“Antigonus of Socoh (saith he) received his learning from Simeon the Just: this was his saying; Be not as servants that serve their master, because of receiving a reward^w; but be as servants, that serve their master, not for the receiving of a reward, but let the fear of God be upon you. This Antigonus had two scholars, which changed his words; they changed them to their scholars, and their scholars to theirs: they stood up and taught after them, and said, What saw our fathers to say thus? is it possible that a workman may do his work all the day, and not receive his wages at even? But if our fathers had known that there is a world to come, and that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, they would never have said thus. They stood up and separated from the law, and from them broke out the two sects, the Sadducees, and Baithusæans: the Sadducees after the name of Sadoc; and the Baithusæans, after the name of Baithus.” So he. Now this Antigonus, whose good doctrine had this bad construction, was scholar to Simeon the Just, whom we shall have occasion to look after by and by.

But the time and occasion of the rising of the Pharisees, is of more obscurity, and the reason of their name admitteth of more conjectures^x; as, whether they were so called from ‘Perush,’ which importeth ‘exposition,’—for that they took upon them to be the great expositors of the law, by their traditions; or from ‘Parush,’ which betokeneth ‘separation,’—for that they accounted and pretended themselves more holy than others of the people, and so became Separatists from them, as despising them^y. Either of which etymologies carry with them a fair and plausible probability of their notation; but the last most agreeable to what both the Scripture and other writings have said of them, in regard of their singularity; and as we shall have farther occasion to descry, when we come to meet with them in their doctrines, practices, or opinions.

And the time of their first starting up, is yet obscurer: but to speak mine own thoughts, I cannot but conceive them to have been somewhat more ancient than the Sadducees, though but a little: and that that passage of the prophet Malachi^z [when he, and the spirit of prophecy with him, was

^w פֶּרֶשׁ ‘a portion.’

^x “Utrum a *Paroscho*, uno ex populi Ducibus, cum ex captivitate reverteretur, Ezra, ii. 3; nam ad illius vocis normam ac sonum, horum nomina sæpissime scribunt auctores Judæi: an forsitan a *Perush*,” &c. See Leusden, vol. 1. p. 320. col. 2.—ED.

^y Luke, xviii. 9.

^z Chap. iv. 4.

to leave this world], “Remember the law of Moses,” gave occasion to the rising of the Pharisees, and to the confirming of the Sadducees in their opinion, when they had taken it up. For whereas the spirit of prophecy and revelation was now to depart from Israel, God having revealed as much of himself, and of his will to them, as he thought fit and necessary,—he sendeth back the people, in this defect of prophetic guidance and direction, to the law of Moses, to be their study, and their rule of faith, and of obedience. Hence did a certain generation among them, take occasion and opportunity to vent and broach traditions and glosses upon the law, pretending them to have descended from Moses himself, and to have been handed over to them, from hand to hand: and as the prophets, while their race continued, expounded Moses, and instructed the people in the knowledge of the law, by the Spirit of God,—so these men (now the prophets were gone) took on them to explain Moses, and the law also,—and by a way which they pretended to be of equal authority with the words of the prophets; “For that (say they) is God’s own gloss upon his own law; and this he taught Moses, while he was with him in the mount: and this, Moses taught Joshua,—and Joshua, the elders; and Eli received it from the elders and from Phinehas, and Samuel from Eli, and David from Samuel,—and Ahijah, the Shilonite, from David,—and Elias from Ahijah, and Elisha from Elias,—and Jehoiada, the priest, from Elisha, and Zacharias from Jehoiada, and Hosea from Zacharias, and Amos from Hosea, and Isaiah from Amos, and Micah from Isaiah, and Joel from Micah, and Nahum from Joel, and Habakkuk from Nahum, and Zephaniah from Habakkuk, and Jeremiah from Zephaniah, and Baruch from Jeremiah,—and Ezra, and his school, from Baruch. The school of Ezra was called ‘the men of the great synagogue;’ and they were Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, Azariah, Nehemiah, Mordecai, Bilshan, Zerubbabel, and many wise men with them, to a hundred and twenty: the last of them was Simeon the Just, and he was in the number of the hundred and twenty, and he was high-priest after Ezra^z.”

This nameless number, that were between the time of Zerubbabel, Nehemiah, Mordecai, and those holy men that we find mentioned in Scripture, and between the times of Simeon the Just,—I suspect to be the generation, that afforded

^z Vid. Rambam in Misn. tom. 1. statim sub initio.

the rise and original of Pharisaism and traditions : for there was a good large space of time and distance between Ezra and Simeon the Just, as might be cleared by several particulars, if that were needful. And a preparative, if not a groundwork, to Pharisaism and traditions, seemeth to be that famous speech of the great synagogue, mentioned in Pirke Aboth^a; “The men of the great synagogue said three things; Be deliberate in judgment,—and raise up scholars in abundance,—and make a hedge to the law.” Now the lesson of ‘making a hedge to the law,’ by a fixed and determinate exposition, was to bring on, and into credit, those glosses and traditions, which they would produce and bring upon it. For that the law should lie to the commons without any fence about it, to keep men off from breaking in upon it by their own interpretations and expositions of it, they could soon persuade the people, was a thing not to be tolerated or endured : and when they had wrought this lesson home upon their hearts, then had they glosses ready, of their own invention, to put upon it, as to hedge or fence in from private interpretations. These glosses or expositions they had a two-fold trick to bring into request:—

First, To pretend strongly, that they had descended traditionally from Moses, and from God himself; as the pretended pedigree of them is showed before.

And, secondly, To use a strict and severe preciseness in their own conversation, and to pretend and show a holiness above other men, and to withdraw from them as too profane for their society; that this might bring their persons into admiration, and their traditions into repute. And thus they came by their name of ‘Separatists;’ and thus they laid the foundation for traditions.

And as the Pharisees took this opportunity and occasion from those words of the prophet, ‘Remember the law of Moses,’ to vent their foolish and wicked expositions upon Moses, as seeming thereby, to do the people a singular benefit, and to make as singular a fence to Moses himself;—so, likewise, did the Sadducees make use of the same occasion to confirm themselves in the error they had taken up, and to assert it unto others,—in that in all the law of Moses,—to the study of which the Holy Ghost had especially directed them in those times, and which Scripture only they embraced,

^a Cap. 1.

—there is not mention nor hint at all, as they pretended, of the resurrection of the dead, or of a world to come.

§ “*Coming to his baptism.*”

The Pharisees and Sadducees were not repulsed by John, though he call them by such a name as ‘vipers,’ but they were baptized by him: as is most apparent by comparing the relation, that St. Luke maketh of this story, and this together. That saying, therefore, of Luke^b, “But the Pharisees rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him,” is to be understood of some of that sect, and not all.

§ “*O generation of vipers.*”

By ‘generation’ we are not to understand the present age; as when it is said, ‘shall rise up in judgment, with this generation;’ ‘an adulterous generation seeketh a sign,’ &c; that is, ‘the people of this age:’—it is not to be so taken, as if the Baptist meant ‘this present generation are vipers:’ for it is not γενεὰ in the original, but γεννήματα: though he include no less in what he speaketh,—and though, if ever generation were viperous, that was. But the Baptist useth an expression, that hitteth and reflecteth upon their fathers and predecessors, as well as themselves; for he calleth them a ‘brood’ or ‘offspring of vipers:’ intimating, that they and their fathers were vipers both. And this he doth, that he might face and affront that fond and vain opinion of theirs, which so much deluded them, and whereupon they built great hopes, and made great boasting,—namely, of their being ‘the children of Abraham:’ “No (saith John), say not within yourselves, ‘We have Abraham to our father;’ for ye are not the seed of the promise, but the seed of the serpent.” And thus he speaketh not only to the Pharisees and Sadducees, the heretics of the nation; but, as Luke enlargeth it, to all the multitude, that came to be baptized: commenting upon the first promise at this first preaching of the gospel; and as, on the one hand, proclaiming Jesus, that was coming after him, to be the seed of the woman,—so, on the other, declaring the Jews to be now become the seed of the serpent, who should persecute and kill the seed of the woman, howsoever they boasted themselves for the holy seed of Abraham.

^b Chap. vii. 20.

And the same lesson our Saviour readeth them, when he giveth them the same title, Matt. xii. 34 ; and xxiii. 33.

Vipers are the worst and most deadly of any serpents ; for they destroy and kill suddenly^c. See Job, xx. 16 ; Isa. xxx. 6 ; and lix. 5 ; from whence the Baptist and our Saviour seem to have this phrase and epithet : and Isa. xli. 24 ; as the margin of our English, and an expositor in David Kimchi, do interpret it.

§ “ *To flee from the wrath to come.*”

In this speech, John seemeth to refer to the last words in all the Old Testament : where Malachi, prophesying of the Baptist, and of his beginning to preach the gospel, “ He shall turn (saith he) the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the hearts of the children to the fathers, ‘ Lest I come and smite the land with a curse.’” This meaneth, ‘ that wrath to come,’” which should surely fall upon them, if they should disobey the gospel, which was now the last means offered them for their conversion. And so it came to pass with them, when, about forty-four years after this, they were destroyed by the Romans.

Matt. iii. 9 : “ *Say not, We have Abraham to our father.*”

This was their common boasting : as John viii. 33 ; the Chaldee paraphrast ; and R. Solomon on Isa. lxii. 6. And so doth Rabbi Solomon conceive, that the Edomites were proud of their descent from Abraham as well as the Jews : for thus he expoundeth those words in the prophecy of Obadiah^d, “ Which dwellest in the clefts of the rock :”—“ He leaneth upon the staff of his fathers, Abraham and Isaac, and they will not profit him.”

§ “ *Of these stones to raise up children to Abraham.*”

Some take this figuratively, as Ignatius Martyr^e, Clemens Alexandrinus^f, and others,—‘ Of the Gentiles, who are stony-hearted towards the truth, and who worship stocks and stones, God is able to raise up children to Abraham.’ But it is rather to be interpreted literally, for the crying down of their idle boasting : that it was but a vain prop whereupon they leaned, to think that it was enough for them that they were descended of Abraham : for God, by his omnipotent

^c Acts, xxviii. 4. 6.

^d Ver. 3.

^e Epist. ad Magnesios.

^f Protrept. ad Græc.

power, was able to make as good and towardly children to Abraham as they were, even of stones.

Matt. iii. 10: “*And now also is the axe laid unto the root of the trees.*”

Whether we read it rationally, as doth the Vulgar Latin, ‘*For now the axe,*’—or conjunctively, as doth our English, ‘*And now also;*’ it plainly sheweth itself to be an argument or reason, used to enforce something that goeth before. And, indeed, it suiteth so very well with any of the three verses next preceding, that it is hard to tell, to which most properly it should be applied. For being laid to the seventh verse, it doth so strongly confirm, that there was ‘a wrath to come,’ that it sheweth it to be hard by, and even close at hand,—“For now the axe is laid to the root of the trees.” Join it to the eighth verse, and it followeth the metaphor that is used there, of ‘bringing forth fruit;’ and enforceth the exhortation or doctrine, that is there given, from the danger that may follow on unfruitful trees; “For now the axe is laid to the root of them.” Or apply it, likewise, to the verse next preceding, and it doth argue against the carnal confidence, that the Jews had in their descending of the stock of Abraham, paraphrastically thus:—“Ye have had warning of wrath that is to come; and you think you are out of the danger of it, because ye are the children of Abraham, and descended lineally from his loins; a prerogative so little to be boasted of, that it may be common with you to stones; for God is able of them to raise up children unto Abraham; and a shelter so little to be trusted under, that look to yourselves,—‘the axe is already laid to the root of the trees.’”

Some by ‘the axe,’ understand ‘the word of God,’ and the preaching of the same, or the publication of the gospel: from Jer. xxiii. 29, after the reading of the LXX; and from Hos. vi. 5. Others, Christ himself, consisting (say they) of two natures, divine and human, as an axe of two parts, the head and the handle. But the current of the most, and the best, expositors, understand it of the judgments of God: and that it is so to be understood, may be strongly concluded by these reasons:—

First, Because the context, both before and after, speaketh of judgment and vengeance to come upon the impeni-

tent and unfruitful, as ‘wrath to come,’ ver. 7; and ‘casting into fire,’ and ‘fire unquenchable,’ ver. 10. 12: and, therefore, it is most proper to expound ‘the axe’ as an instrument destroying, for judgment or destruction.

Secondly, This place seemeth plainly to have reference to Isa. x. 33, 34: “Behold, the Lord, the Lord of hosts, shall lop the bough with terror: and the high ones of stature shall be hewn down, and the haughty shall be humbled. And he shall cut down the thickets of the forests with iron, and Lebanon shall fall by a mighty one:” which how the more ancient Jews understood of the destruction of their state and kingdom, and that near upon the coming of Christ,—a testimony of their own, in their Talmud, in the treatise Beracoth, may sufficiently evidence:—“There was a certain Jew (say they) was ploughing, and one of his oxen lowed. The ox, lowing, told of the coming of the Lord. A certain Arabian, passing by, heard the lowing of the ox, and said unto the Jew, ‘O Jew, unyoke thine oxen, and care not for thine implements; for your sanctuary is destroyed:’—And the ox lowed again: and the Arabian saith, ‘O Jew, yoke thine oxen, and make fit thine implements; for your Messiah is born,’ &c. Rabbi Abuni said, And what need you to learn this of an Arabian? The text is plain in Isaiah, which saith, ‘Lebanon shall fall by a mighty one:’ and it followeth, ‘And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his root.’ ”

§ “*To the root of the trees.*”

First, By ‘the root of the trees,’ might be understood the root of Jesse, of which mention was made before from Isa. xi. 1. For, in all the crosses and calamities, wars, overthrows, and captivities, that had befallen the nation of the Jews,—the stock of Jesse, or line of David, could never be rooted out, or extinguished; because the promise, that Christ should come out of it, did preserve and keep it alive, in despite of all opposition, till he that was promised, did come indeed. But now, seeing that he was come, and that that line had no more the shelter and preservative of the promise, it also must come to ruin and rooting out, as well as others.

Secondly; ‘The axe is now laid to the very root’ of your confidence and boasting: for, whereas ye say within yourselves, and stand upon it, That ye have Abraham to your

father,—the time is now come, that that distinction betwixt who is, and who is not, of the seed of Abraham, shall be no more regarded, nor looked after: but every one, of what nation soever, that feareth God, shall be accepted of him; and the seed of Abraham, for not fearing him, shall be rejected, and that privilege not respected at all.

Thirdly; Jerusalem was at the root of the whole nation, from which they derived the sap of religion and policy; but now the axe of destruction is laid even to that.

Fourthly; This phrase may be understood, as comparing the ruin of the Jews, here threatened, with those desolations they had felt before: for then, as at the captivity of Babylon for example, they were not utterly cut off from their land for ever, but had a promise of returning, and returned, and were planted there again: but now the vengeance threatened must strike at the very root, and quite destroy them from being a nation for ever, and from all hope of returning to their country any more.

By the ‘axe being now laid to the root of the trees,’ may fitly be understood,—1. The certainty of their desolation: and, 2. the nearness: in that the instrument of their destruction was already prepared and brought close to them; the Romans, that should ruin their city and nation, being already masters and rulers over them.

Luke, iii. 10: “*And the people asked him,*” &c.

Or, ‘the multitude,’ as ver. 7; which verse, compared with this, sheweth, that the question, ‘what shall we do then,’ proceeded from those, to whom the Baptist addressed his last speech, ‘O ye generation of vipers,’ &c; which were Pharisees and Sadducees, as appeareth by Matthew,—and other multitude mixed among, as by Luke. Now, whether this their question proceeded from the apprehension of the danger threatened, or application of the exhortation urged,—whether they desired to learn how to avoid the evil of the wrath to come, or to do the good works of repentance, when they ask, ‘what shall we do,’—is neither so material to search, nor easy to find, as it is fit to observe, how powerfully the doctrine of the Baptist hath wrought with them, when it hath thus brought them to look off the goodness of Abraham, in which they trusted,—and to think after goodness of their own.

Ver. 11: “ *He that hath two coats, let him impart to him, that hath none,*” &c.

It appeareth by the Baptist’s answer, that their question demanded, what were those good fruits, that he called upon them to bring forth, ver. 8, 9; and the Ποιήσομεν here may seem to have respect to the Ποιήσατε and μὴ ποιοῦν, in those verses.

His answer is an exhortation to almsdeeds, or giving to the needy, rather than any other lesson; not that thereby they might think to satisfy for their sins, or merit for themselves, but for divers other important and considerable ends. For, 1. He setteth them this as an easy lesson; for yet they were but very children in the evangelical school. To have put them, at their first entry into this school, to the hard lecture of self-denial, mortification, patience, and joy in persecution, and other such things as these,—had been too strong meat for such babes, too difficult a task for such infants to take out; and therefore he setteth them this easy copy, and layeth no greater an imposition upon them, than what even the weakest of them might follow and undergo,—to impart of their abundance to the poor.

2. The tenor of the gospel is mercy, and not sacrifice^s; and, therefore, he putteth not upon them the cost of oblations and offerings, which were required by the law,—nor the fasting and pining of the body, as did many of his own disciples,—but the lovely works of charity and mercy; the first and most visible of which is relief of the needy.

3. By this he putteth them to trial, how they forsake the world, by parting with their worldly goods; how they live by faith, in not fearing poverty, though they give of their wealth away; how they love their neighbour as themselves, in making him partner of what they have; and how their eyes are fixed on things to come, by giving away here, and looking for reward thereof in heaven.

And, 4. It may be very well supposed, that among the multitude, that stood before him, the Baptist saw some rich, and some poor,—some, in good clothing,—and some, in mean; and that the present object that he beheld, might be some occasion to him to propose this lesson to be put presently in practice.

§ “*That hath two coats,*” &c.

He requireth not wilful poverty, but almsdeeds of their superfluity; not to give away their coat, if they have but one,—but, if they have two, then give one of them: and to the same purpose, he useth *βρώματα*, ‘meats,’ in the plural number: not to go naked themselves, that they may clothe others; nor to prevent others begging by their alms, and to beg themselves; but what they have above their own necessities, to contribute to the necessities of the needy; and first to love themselves, and then their neighbours as themselves.

Ver. 12: “*Publicans.*”

Publicans, at the first, were such, as gathered the tributes and custom of the Romans in those countries and provinces, that were under their dominion. And this, at that time, was an honourable place and calling. For Tully^h, commending M. Varro to Brutus, giveth these two reasons of the strong tie of friendship betwixt them: “The one is (saith he), because he is versed in my way of studies, in which I am chiefly delighted: and the other, because he betook himself maturely to the company of the publicans; which, indeed, I would not have had him to have done, because he had suffered great losses; and yet the cause of that common order, of me most highly esteemed, made our friendship the stronger.” And in his oration for Plancius, he saith, “That the flower of the Roman knights, the ornament of the city, the strength of the commonwealth, is comprehended in the order of the publicans.” And so it was an honourable memorial that was left, *τῷ καλῶς τελωνήσαντι*, “To him that had played the good publicanⁱ.”

But, in after times, the quality of the office itself, and the conditions of the officers, became very much altered. For now, men of inferior rank farmed those places, and took the office upon a yearly rent, and quickly brought the calling into disgrace. So that, in the gospel, publicans are branded with a special note of infamy above other men, and still go hand in hand with the most notorious sinners.

And this, first, generally, every where, because of their covetousness, and racking exactions, which are the common fruits of buying and farming of offices. Tacitus^j calleth them “*immodestiam publicanorum*,” “the immodesty of

^h Epist. lib. 13. 10. edit. Benedict. t. ii. p. 398.

ⁱ Suetonius in vita Vespasiani statim sub initio.

^j Annal. lib. 13.

the publicans,"—and mentioneth a general complaint against them in the time of Nero, and some reformation of their injuriousness. And Suidas giveth them this character; "The life of the publicans, is open violence, unpunished rapine, an unseasonable trade, and a shameless merchandise."

Secondly; More especially were men of this profession odious among the Jews; because, whereas they held themselves to be a freeborn nation, and that they ought not to be subject to any, nor pay tribute, but only their dues to God, and homage to their own king,—these wretches, as enemies to the common liberty, did help forward their subjection in exacting of custom, though they were of the same nation themselves; complying too much with the Romans' company, contrary to Jews' punctualness of sequestration from the heathen, and too much with their tyranny in augmenting those burdens of bondage, which they had made heavy enough before.

Ver. 13: "*Exact no more,*" &c.

By this answer is approved what is said immediately before, about their extortion:—that not only they sided with the Romans, in putting the Jews their own nation to tribute,—but also did aggravate the burden themselves, by exaction of more than was required by the Roman governors. Now, it is observable, that, of the Pharisees and Sadducees, the Baptist requireth, affirmatively, some duties to be done, "He that hath two coats," &c. because these people stood upon their own righteousness, and pleaded perfection; therefore, will he try them by the touchstone of action: but of the soldiers and publicans, he requireth only, negatively, some enormities to be foregone: for they being notoriously and scandalously wicked, it was necessary they should first cease to do evil, before they could learn or be brought to do good.

Ver. 14: "*The soldiers.*"

These were Romans, or some of other nations under the Roman pay; for no one can think, that the Romans would use the Jews for their garrisons in their own country, lest they should rebel: and here do the Gentiles first hearken to the gospel.

§ "*Do violence to no man,*" &c.

The Baptist, in his answer, tieth both hand, tongue, and

heart,—deed, word, and thought, from the injury of another; their profession, especially, tending so much towards injuriousness.

First; He forbiddeth them to open violence in act, whether by blows, ravishing, plunder, firing, or such-like mischiefs as attend the wars, and go with soldiers.

Secondly; Secret underminings, by false accusing,—abusing the power of the superior, to the wrong of another, when their own could not reach,—and sewing the fox's skin to, when the lion's was too short. And,

Thirdly; Discontentation and repining at their wages, which, indeed, was the cause and original of both the other. And so is that a main argument used by Percennius, which moved the great mutiny of the three legions in Pannonia, in the very entry of the reign of Tiberius; “*Denis in diem assibus corpus et animam æstimari:*” “How poor a thing it was, that their lives and bodies were rated and set to sale but at ten farthings a day^k.”

It is observable, in both the answers of the Baptist, to the publicans, and to the soldiers, that he gainsayeth not their professions, but their abuse of them: to the one, he forbiddeth not to gather tribute, but to exact more; and to the other, not to exercise soldiery, but practise violence.

Ver. 15: “*As the people were in expectation,*” &c.

Divers things there were, that concurred to make the Jews to think of Christ, when they saw the Baptist,—and to muse in heart, whether he were He or not.

First; The first and the prime one was the agreement of the time. For they had learned by divers pregnant evidences, both in the law and in the prophets, that this was the time, when Christ should come: for now was the sceptre departed from Judah; now was the lawgiver, or Sanhedrim, slain by Herod; now were the Romans lords of their nation; and now were Daniel's seventies expired, by which they knew that this was the time; and now they looked that the kingdom of heaven should appear^l; and they gather together, from all nations, to Jerusalem, to see its appearing^m, as was hinted before.

When, therefore, secondly, in this time of their great

^k Tacit. Annal. lib. 1. cap. 17. edit. Ruperti, pag. 47.

^l Luke, xix. 11.

^m Acts, ii.

expectation, they behold the excellent sanctity, piety, and zeal; the admirable strictness, austerity, and spirit;—and,

Thirdly, The strange, unusual, and powerful manner of the preaching of the Baptist;—it is no wonder, if they entertained a doubtful and musing thought of him, whether he were the Christ or no. And,

Fourthly, Their longing desire, and earnest wishing after Messiah's coming, might something forward such a conceit, for “*facile credimus, quod volumus*,” and the Greek word doth import, a desire joined with their expectation. So Christ, in Gen. xlix. 10, is *προσδοκία ἐθνῶν* in the LXX, “the expectation of the nations;” and their “desire,” Hag. ii. 7. It is not unlike, but the coming of the wise men, the words of Simeon and Anna, and other testimonies of Christ then come, were dispersed among very many, and notice taken of them; and this might be a strengthening, and helping forward, of this surmise; but, that the strangeness of the Baptist's birth, and of what befel his father about it, should be any induction or seconding thereunto, as some do hold, is hard to be believed; unless we can think, that either this people had forgot to look after the tribe of Judah for the Messiah,—or that Elisabeth's alliance to that tribe, for she was cousin to the Virgin Maryⁿ,—did satisfy them, if they looked after it.

Ver. 16: “*John answered.*”

Whereas some hold, that John knew the thoughts of their hearts, by the revelation of the Spirit, for it is said only before, that they mused of the matter in their heart, and put it not to question,—it is far more probable, that John came to know this their thought, by some outward expression of their own. For, among so great a multitude, when they were all in the same doubt and hesitation, it was impossible, but there would break out some whisperings, questions, arguings, or other token of the general conceit, that even a slow and dull apprehension might, in short time, have found it out.

§ “*I, indeed, baptize you,*” &c.

All the evangelists have this answer of the Baptist, in regard of the substance; but, in some circumstances, there is difference among them. As, first, whereas Luke saith,

ⁿ Luke, i. 36.

that these words were occasioned from him, by the thoughts of the people,—Matthew, that hitherto hath joined with him in this story, even to the very words, hath no such thing, as about the questions aforementioned, nor about this supposal,—but joineth this as a continued speech to the Pharisees and Sadducees: but this needeth to breed no scruple, seeing that it is not only usual, but also necessary, among the Four, one to relate what another hath omitted,—and one to declare at large, what another hath done in brief.

Secondly; Whereas both Luke and Matthew have set this testimony of the Baptist, after other speeches of his made before,—Mark, as was mentioned before, hath set it the first of all his preaching; and, indeed, hath mentioned no speech else: but this he hath done, partly, because he would hasten to the baptism, preaching, and miracles, of Christ; partly, because Matthew had set out the matter at large before; but chiefly, to give us to know, that this witness went along with John in all his sermons, and to all companies that came to be baptized.

Thirdly; Whereas Luke hath alleged this speech, as an answer to the people's thoughts, John hath brought it as an answer to an open question°. And here it may be questioned, indeed, whether these two speak of one and the same thing, and of the same time: but the resolution is easy, that they do not. For as it is plain by Luke, that these words, mentioned by him, proceeded from John, before the baptism of Christ,—so is it as plain by John, that those in him came from him after: for, in ver. 26, he intimateth, that Christ himself had already stood among them, but they knew him not; no, nor he himself, but by the Holy Ghost, which he saw descend upon him, ver. 33:—by which is confirmed, what was said even now, that John made sure to bear this witness to Christ, at all times, and before all companies. Now, because the eyes of the people upon himself, looked at the strangeness of his baptism, and the sanctity of his person; therefore, doth he apply this his testimony accordingly, by comparing Christ and himself, and his baptism and his together, and proclaiming his own inferiority in both, as far as baptism with water only, is below baptizing with the Holy Ghost,—and farther than the servant that unties his master's shoes, is below him that wears them.

° John, i. 25—27.

§ “ *I baptize you.*”

Mark hath it in another tense, “ I have baptized :” which either may import the continuedness of John’s baptizing, this being compared with Matthew and Luke, as Jansenius hath conjoined them, “ I have baptized, and do baptize you ;” or, rather, doth it intimate, that he still baptized the companies, that came unto him ; and then gave this testimony to them concerning Christ. For his preaching was, first, of repentance ; and then, having won the people to be baptized, he brought them to the water, and baptized them in the name of him, that was to come after him^p. So that these seem to have been the words, that he used in sprinkling, or applying the water : “ I baptize thee with water ; but a mightier than I cometh, who shall baptize with the Holy Ghost, and with fire.”

§ “ *With water.*”

In the Greek it is indifferently, *with* or *in*, answerable to the significancy of ׀ the Hebrew preposition, either local or instrumental : and according to both senses it may be taken here. For as it is undoubted, that John brought those that were to be baptized, into the river^q,—so is it almost as little to be doubted, that when they were there, he threw and sprinkled the water upon them, both to answer the types of sprinkling, that had preceded in the law, and the predictions thereof, that were given by the prophets, Ezek. xxxvi. 25 ; understood by Jerome of baptism, Epist. lxxxiii. So [Acts, viii. 38] the eunuch first goeth into the water, and then Philip baptizeth him.

§ “ *Water.*”

As the form of the church was changed at the coming of Christ, from Jewish to Christian, and from legal to evangelical,—so is it no wonder, if the sacraments were changed therewithal. For if Christ were to give a new law, as Moses did the old, which the Jews themselves confess that he must, and the prophets had foretold that he should, do,—it was also necessary, that he should give these new, as well as other things. But it is some wonder, that, seeing he instituted the sacrament, that should succeed the Passover so near to the nature of the Passover, as that it was a supper, as well as it,—there should such a main distance and difference

^p xix. 4.^q Matt. iii. 6. 16.

be between baptism and circumcision, the one of which should succeed the other; for what affinity betwixt washing with water, and cutting off of the foreskin?—For the better viewing of the reason of which difference, it will be necessary to consider the main particulars of either sacrament apart, and then may the reader compare them together, in their variety.

First, then, circumcision to Abraham was a seal of the promise, “Thou shalt be the father of many nations:” but to his seed, of the promise of the land of Canaan, “I will give to thee, and to thy seed, all the land of Canaan: therefore, thou, and thy seed after thee, shall keep my covenant^r.” And such a different end may be observed, in the administration of baptism to Christ himself, and the administering of it unto Christians. The text alleged, sealeth the lease of the land of Canaan to the seed of Abraham, with the seal of circumcision, and confineth that ceremony only to that land, and only to their continuance there. And upon this inference, “I will give thy seed the land of Canaan; *therefore*, shall they keep my covenant,”—it was, that Joshua, as soon as ever they had set foot upon that land, was commanded to circumcise them^s: and from hence it will follow, first, that that land must be considered dilated, as far as circumcision went, with the seed of Abraham, in Ishmaelites, Midianites, Edomites, and others.

Secondly; Hence they will be found to erect circumcision again in the church of Christ, that hold, the called Jews shall have a temporal kingdom again in the land of Canaan.

And, thirdly, hence it may be resolved, why that sacrament was deferred so long, and not given to the world before. Adam, Enoch, Noah, Heber, &c, were not circumcised; because, to them, a fixed and settled place for the church to reside together, was not designed; but when such a one is designed to Abraham, then circumcision is given also.

The land of Canaan was bequeathed to Shem, by his father Noah. The occasion was, because Cham, and his son Canaan, derided Noah’s nakedness, as he lay asleep in the midst of his tent. When, therefore, that land is to be settled upon the right heirs of Shem, to which God, in the prophetic spirit of Noah, intended it,—a seal and an assurance thereof is given in that member, which had been derided by Ca-

^r Gen. xvii. 8, 9.^s Josh. v.

naan, to his loss of that land, and to his perpetual slavery. This was a main reason, why males alone were circumcised, and why in that member; because a male alone, and that member in him, was so derided. Other reasons of the institution of the ceremony, and only for masculines, and in that part, might concur for instruction,—such as are given by Lombard, Aquinas, Biel, Lyra, and others: but, that they were not of the nature or essence of the sacrament, and that this forementioned was the vigour and spirit of it, may be concluded by these two things:—

First; That circumcision concerned not the children of Israel only, but the whole seed of Abraham: for those children of his, by his concubines, that lived in Arabia,—as Ishmaelites, Dedanites, Medanites, Midianites, Shuhites, Amalekites, and the rest,—were circumcised, as well as Israel in Palestine. Those countries whither Abraham had sent them to inhabit, were once in the possession of Canaanites, till he obtained them by conquest of the four kings^t; and thither he sendeth them with the seal of circumcision upon them, which gave them interest in the land there, as well as Isaac had elsewhere: “Abraham taught his children, and his household after him, to keep the way of the Lord^u;” which though this offspring of his in Arabia did not long in other things,—yet, in circumcision, it did. So that from hence may result the observation of another end and reason of the institution of this ceremony,—namely, for distinction, not of Israel from other nations, as Lyranus would have it,—but of the seed of Abraham from all other people.

Secondly; Howsoever all the Israelites, dwelling, before the coming of our Saviour, out of the land of Canaan (as both^v of the Babylonian and Grecian dispersion), used circumcision in heathen lands, and used it lawfully; yet it was because their claim and interest to the land of Canaan did still continue: nay, this was one reason, why it held up some store of years after Christ's coming and ascension. But when Jerusalem was destroyed, and their lease of that land of promise either expired or forfeited, or both; then did this seal of it fall and come to ruin also, and might not lawfully be used ever after: and when they must for ever relinquish the land, they must

^t Gen. xiv.

^u Gen. xviii. 19.

^v “*Ut qui ex Græcâ Babylonicâque dispersione supererant:*” Leusden, vol. 1. p. 328.

for ever also relinquish this seal, or ceremony, that had assured it. This well considered, will cause us also to observe:—

First, That the interest of Israel in the holy land began shake, when baptism came to shoulder out circumcision. Secondly, That John most properly preached much of ‘the kingdom of heaven;’ for their earthly one began to cease, when baptism began to extinguish circumcision.

As circumcision itself had relation to the inheritance of the land of the Canaanites,—so the fixed time for the administration of it, namely, the eighth day, seemeth also to have some aim and respect to the same thing. For seven nations were in that land, which the children of Abraham were to subdue, and dwell in their stead; Canaanites, Hittites, Hivites, Perizzites, Girgashites, Amorites, and Jebusites^w. In correspondence to this number of seven nations that were to be subdued,—Jericho, the first field fought in that land, is compassed seven days, and seven times the seventh day. And in like answerableness, every child of Abraham, for seven days, was like the children of those seven nations; but, on the eighth day, he was to receive circumcision,—the pledge of that interest and claim that he had in that land, which those seven nations had usurped.

This, then, was the groundwork and original of that sacrament,—that every son of Abraham might bear in his body the seal of the inheritance of the land of promise, and the badge of distinction from all other people; and that this visible sign might make him strive after the invisible grace which it sealed, the inheritance of heaven, and walking as the peculiar of the Lord. From which appropriated and restrictive ends of the rite, the necessity of the changing of it at the coming of Christ, doth plainly appear: for when there was to be no more distinction betwixt the children of Abraham, and other people, and no one land more peculiarized than another,—but of every land and nation, he that feareth God, and worketh righteousness, is accepted of him; that badge of appropriation, and seal of singularity, must either clean come to nothing, or become unnecessary.

Now, that baptism did succeed in the stead thereof, some reasons may be given. As, first, because the sacraments of the New Testament were to be gentle and easy, instead of the smart and burdensome ones of the law. Secondly, Be-

^w Deut. vii. 1. Josh. iii. 10.

cause God would comply with men, even in their own common custom, of washing children when they are newly born^x, and turn the common to a sacred use, thereby to catch and win them the more. But, thirdly, this one main reason may serve for all; namely, the near correspondency that is between the sacrament, and the thing signified, and the full significancy that the element beareth of the grace, that it signeth forth. To which, fourthly, might be added, that baptism took place in the Christian church, to fulfil the types and predictions that had gone before of it under Moses's law, and before:—as in the flood and ark^y; in the passage through the Red Sea and Jordan^z; in the purifications and sprinklings at the sanctuary; but, especially, in four remarkable particulars, was this foreshadowed and typed out in a special manner:—

First, In Jacob's admission of the preserved Shechemites to his family and communion^a; “And Jacob said to his household, and all that were with him, Put away the strange gods that are among you, and be clean, and change your garments.” Wherein he enjoineth them three things for their admission to his church:—1. To relinquish their idolatry. 2. To wash or baptize their bodies; for so must the *הטהרו* ‘Make yourselves clean,’ be understood; and so it is well rendered by Aben Ezra. Especially, 3. Since he giveth order for the changing of their garments: all three containing the cleansing of their minds, bodies, and clothes. And there observe, first, that when circumcision, in the next chapter before, had proved a sacrament of death to the Shechemites,—Jacob useth baptism for admission of proselytes in the stead thereof. Secondly, That the company to be admitted are females [unless there were some Syrian male idolaters], for all the males of Shechem were slain^b, or, at the least, the most of them; and, therefore, he useth a sacrament, which women also might come under; for under circumcision they did not come.

Secondly, In the admission of the Israelites to the hearing of the law, by sanctification and washing^c; from which the Jews themselves did ground the baptizing of proselytes, as a special ground.

Thirdly, At the making of the covenant at Sinai, the introduction of Israel to the visible church was by baptism, or

^x Ezek. xvi. 4. 9.

^a Gen. xxxv. 2.

^y 1 Pet. iii. 21.

^b Gen. xxxiv. 25.

^z 1 Cor. x. 2.

^c Exod. xix. 10.

the sprinkling of water, as well as of blood, as saith St. Paul^d; yea, and even the Jews themselves:—"Our Rabbins teach (saith Rabbi Solomon), that our fathers entered into the covenant, and baptism, and sprinkling of blood: for there was no sprinkling of blood without baptism^e:"—In that in the times of David and Solomon, when heathens were converted to the Jews' religion by multitudes, their admission to their church was by baptism, and not by circumcision. And the groundwork of this their practice, was, because Israel, coming out of Egypt, washed their garments; and the priests, coming from their common employments to their function, washed their bodies. Let all be concluded in the words of the Talmud^f; "Rabbi Akiba said, O Israel, you are blessed: before whom are ye justified or cleansed? or who is he that cleanseth you? It is your heavenly Father, as it is said,—I will pour clean water upon you."

"Our masters say, That bastards and Gibeonites shall be all justified in time to come. And this is the doctrine of Ezekiel; as it written,—I will pour clean water upon you^g."

Matt. iii. 11: "*Unto repentance.*"

Here the schools think they find a main difference between the baptism of John, and the baptism used in the Christian church; because *that* was only the baptism of repentance, and the *other* of grace, and remission of sins: but that there was no essential or substantial difference between them, shall be seen anon.

Luke, iii. 16: "*But one mightier than I cometh.*"

Though, by this mightiness of Christ above the Baptist, his omnipotency or all-powerfulness, as he is God, may well and truly be understood, as many expositors do take it,—yet, since John speaketh of him, as he should show himself among the people when he came, and in comparison with himself, as concerning preaching and baptizing,—it cannot be, but his words have respect to some particular things, wherein Christ showed this mightiness above John; yea, even conversing among men in his human flesh, and in what respected his preaching and ministerial office. And these may be reduced unto these four heads:—

First, The power of miracles, which Christ had, but John

^d Heb. ix. 19.

^e R. Sol. in loc. 4.

^f In Kippurim.

^g In Kiddushin.

had not: for John wrought no miracle^b; nor was it fit he should; since he, in whom that power rested, as in its proper centre, was so near to come, and so ready to show it.

Secondly, In the different power of the preaching of John, and of our Saviour, and their conversion of the people,—John many, but Christ far moreⁱ.

Thirdly, In the seal and confirmation of their doctrine and ministry: for whereas John sealed it with his death, our Saviour did not only so, but also with his resurrection.

Fourthly, In continuance and increase of their preaching, and disciples; and this difference John showeth himself, John iii. 30. To which may be annexed, the excellency of Christ's baptism, above that of John's, which is the very thing that is in comparison; "I baptize you with water; but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost."

§ "*The latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose.*"

The sense is but strained which delighteth so many,—namely, that John confesseth, under this simile, that he is unable to resolve the great mystery of the incarnation; seeing Matthew giveth this his speech in other words,—and Mark, by adding one word more to these, maketh it more necessary to take them in their literal meaning. For Matthew hath it thus, "Whose shoes I am not worthy to bear;" and Mark, "The latchet of whose shoes, I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose." Both jointly showing, that the Baptist hath no mystical and figurative meaning in this his speech, but doth, in plain and downright terms, aver his inferiority to Christ, that was to come after him, to be infinitely great, and more than a servant's,—that ties his master's shoes, or carries them,—is to his master. For these meanest and basest of offices of servant to master, he instanceth in, that he might express the infinite distance betwixt him and Christ the more to the life, and to the people's apprehension.

§ "*He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost.*"

Hence ariseth that opinion, so mightily taken up in the schools, and embraced, concerning the great disparity and difference betwixt the baptism used in the Christian church, and the baptism of John; 'for this (say they) could not confer grace; but the other doth: and John's was but as a

^b John, x. 41.

ⁱ John, iii. 26.

mean betwixt the purifications of the Jews, and the baptism of Christians.'—In which, first, the words of the Baptist are misconstrued; and, secondly, there is a difference pretended, where there is none at all.

For, first, John compareth not his own baptism with ours, but his own with Christ's. For that he meaneth not the baptism that Christ instituted to be used by others, but that he practised and exhibited personally himself, is plain,—in that he mentioneth not water, in Christ's baptizing; which our Saviour himself doth, when he speaketh of the baptism that they mean^j; and in that he saith, personally, that Christ should baptize,—which, with water, he never did^k.

Secondly; By 'the Holy Ghost,' wherewith Christ should baptize,—is not meant the grace concomitant to our Christian baptism, as they suppose; but his sending down the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit; as is plain by our Saviour's own exposition, Acts, i. 5: "For John, indeed, baptized with water; but you shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence." Where, using the very same words with these of the Baptist, and applying the baptizing with the Holy Ghost, plainly and undeniably, to his sending down of the Holy Ghost, on Pentecost-day,—he hath given a sure, plain, and undoubted, explanation of these words.

Thirdly; Neither, if the baptism of John, and the baptism used in the Christian church, be well compared together, will any such difference or diversity be found betwixt them,—nay, set the form of words aside, no difference at all.

For, first, They both had the same institution from Christ; for he, that sent the apostles to baptize, sent also the Baptist^l.

Secondly; They both had the same element,—water.

Thirdly; They had both the same end,—repentance. For though our Christian baptism is called the 'baptism for remission of sins^m;' and a great deal of pre-eminence of this, above that of John, picked, as is thought, out of that title,—yet is it no more than what is said of the baptism of Johnⁿ.

Fourthly; Whereas it is commonly said, that one end

^j John, iii. 5.

^k John, iv. 2.

^l John, i. 33.

^m Acts, ii. 38.

ⁿ Mark, i. 4.

of our Saviour's being baptized, was, that he might sanctify our baptism,—how can this be supposed, if he received not our baptism, but one different from it?

Fifthly; The disciples were baptized with no baptism but that of John; for Christ baptized them not; and who other should do, it cannot be imagined: and, therefore, if this of ours be more excellent than John's, we have a better baptism than the apostles, that first administered it.

Sixthly, and lastly; Howsoever the schools, without any stumbling, do hold rebaptization of those, that had received the baptism of John; this crosseth their own tenet, that his was a degree above the washings under the law, for their imperfection was showed by their reiteration; and, in this, they make his to differ nothing at all. And whereas it is said [Acts, xix. 5], that some, that were baptized with the baptism of John, upon Paul's instruction of them, were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus: it was rather their renewing to their baptism, than their baptism to them; and not that they took any other than that of John, but that they now began to entertain and apply it to the right intent. As it may be exemplified in circumcision in any heathen son of Abraham; as in Jethro, for an instance. He was circumcised, while he was an unbeliever, because he was a Midianite, a child of Abraham; now, when he came to be a convert, and embraced the true religion, he was not to be circumcised again; for that was not possible: but he then began to know and apply the right use and meaning of his circumcision; and so was renewed to it, and not it to him. Or those words,—“When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus,”—may be understood to be the words of Paul, and not of Luke; as see Beza, in loc.

This phrase of “baptizing with the Holy Ghost,” sheweth, first, the restoring of the Holy Ghost, which long ago was departed from Israel, and gone up.

Secondly; The abundance and plenteousness of that gift, when it should be exhibited, that it should be ‘as water poured upon them;’ as the word is used, Joel, ii. 28.

Thirdly; It sheweth whither all the washings and purifyings of the law aimed, and had respect; namely, to the washing and purging of men, by the Holy Ghost.

§ “*You.*”

That is, some of you; as, 1 Sam. viii. 11: “He will take your sons;” that is, some of them: or *you*, that is, the people; as, Deut. xviii. 15: “The Lord shall raise to *thee* a Prophet;” that is, to thy people,—“and unto him *you* shall hearken;” that is, the nation of your posterity.

§ “*And with fire.*”

From Isa. iv. 4: “The Lord shall wash the filthiness of the daughter of Zion, and purge the blood of Jerusalem out of the midst thereof, by the spirit of judgment, and by the spirit of burning.” It is easily to be resolved, what John meaneth here, by *fire*;—seeing our Saviour himself hath applied the other part of his speech to the coming down of the Holy Ghost, on the Pentecost-day; when, we know, he appeared in the visible shape of tongues of fire°. Now, Christ’s baptizing, in this manner, with fire, was, 1. That the giving of the Holy Ghost might fully answer the giving of the law, both for time and manner; for both were given at Pentecost, and both in fire. 2. To express the various operations of the Holy Ghost; which are fitly resembled and represented by the effects of fire:—As, 1. To enlighten with knowledge: 2. To inflame with zeal: 3. To burn up corruption: 4. To purify the nature: 5. To turn the man to its own qualification of sanctity; as fire maketh all things, that it seizeth, like itself. 3. To strike terror in the hearts of men, lest they should despise the gospel; and to win reverence to the Holy Ghost, for fear of the fire. 4. Hereby was clearly and fully showed, the life and significancy of the sacrifices under the law; upon whom there came a fire from heaven: intimating, that they are lively sacrifices, and accepted, who are inflamed by the Holy Ghost, from above.

And thus the two elements, that have, and shall, destroy the world, water and fire,—hath God been pleased to use for the benefit and salvation of his chosen.

Ver. 17: “*Whose fan is in his hand.*”

By ‘the fan’ in the hand of Christ, the most expositors understand the power of judgment, that God, the Father, hath committed to him; “For the Father judgeth no man,

° Acts, ii.

but hath committed all judgment to the Son^p." And thus some take it, for an argument against security, to all: and others, against apostasy, to those that have been baptized with the Holy Ghost: and that, as the Baptist, in the former words, hath told what Christ would do, at his first coming, and appearance;—so, in these, what he will do, at his second:—but I rather adhere to the interpretation of them, that, by 'the fan' of Christ, understand the gospel, and his preaching and publication of the same; and that, upon these reasons:—

First; Because, unless it be thus taken, we have not here any testimony at all, given by the Baptist, to the people, concerning that part of the office of Christ. Now, that being a matter of so great importance, as that the prophets do more insist upon the preaching of Christ, and his power in the gospel, than upon any other thing, that concerned him, in the work of redemption; and this being, in several respects, more regardable than his baptizing with the Holy Ghost;—it cannot be imagined, that John should omit to bear witness of him for such a thing; nay, it had been to neglect to bear witness of him for the chief thing of all.

Secondly; Because the gospel, or the word of God, is the proper touchstone, that trieth and differenceth betwixt gold and dross, truth and falsehood, pure and vile: and this is the instrument wherewith he confoundeth every strong hold, that exalteth itself against himself^q. And,

Thirdly; Because John speaketh of Christ, as he should presently show himself among them, as it is apparent, in the verse preceding,—and not as he should show himself at the end of the world.

§ "His floor."

If these words, and those that follow, be applied to the whole church, in all places, and at all times, in general,—the application may be very profitable and pertinent, as giving warning to all men, to bring forth the fruits of repentance, for fear of the judgment to come: and so the end of this verse may be of the same use, with the end of the ninth, to all men whatsoever: but that by the 'floor of Christ,' in this place, is meant, the church of Israel, or the

^p John, v. 22.

^q Isa. xi. 4. 2 Thess. ii. 8. Rev. i. 16, and ii. 16.

nation of the Jews alone, may be concluded upon these observations:—

First; That the title given, ‘his floor,’ is but the very epithet of Isaiah, that he giveth to Israel, Isa. xxi. 10, “O my threshing, and the corn of my floor:” which though some expositors, both Jewish and Christian, apply to Babel, yet let the reader, upon common reason, and serious examination, be the judge.

Secondly; Because the phrase of fanning of that nation, betokeneth their final desolation, Jer. xv. 7: “I will fan them with a fan, in the gates of the land:” and the Baptist seemeth, in these expressions, his ‘fan,’ and his ‘floor,’ to have reference to these two prophets.

Thirdly; Because the words, being thus appropriated to Israel, have the more agreement with the verses preceding, which tell of the wrath to come upon that nation, and of the axe already laid to the root of that tree.

Fourthly; The phrase of ‘thoroughly purging,’ which the Greek word importeth [and the same word is used both by Luke and Mark], denoteth a final separation of the wheat and chaff, and an utter consumption of the wicked: and this being spoken only to the Jews, and to those Gentiles that were mingled with them, they cannot so fitly be applied to any thing as to that nation, and their utter desolation;—for God had often purged them before; but now their ‘thorough purging’ is near at hand, when Christ, by the fan of the gospel, shall have sifted and tried them, and found them out, who was wheat, and who was chaff. And,

Fifthly; This exposition is consented to, even by the Jews themselves, the more ancient of whom have held, that the coming of Christ should be the final desolation of their nation. So doth their whole Sanhedrim confess^r: “This man doth many miracles; and, if we let him alone, all men will believe on him, and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation.” And to the same tenor of confession is that collection of the Talmud, cited ere while from the last verse of the tenth chapter of Isaiah, and the first of the eleventh, where the fall of the forest and Lebanon, and the coming of the branch out of the stem of Jesse, are laid together. And, to the same purpose, doth the Chaldee paraphrast render Isa. lxvi. 7: “Before her

^r John, xi. 48.

pains came, she was redeemed; and before the pangs of her birth, Messias, her king, was revealed:”—a text, from which Rabbi Samuel Bar Nachman, in Bereshith Rabba, concludeth, that the destruction of the temple, and the birth of the Messias, should be near together.

And, lastly; That this verse, as it was spoken only, so also is to be applied only, to the Jews,—may be somewhat inferred from the titles given to the parties spoken of, ‘wheat’ and ‘chaff,’ which both grow from one root, and come up upon the same stalk; resembling, fitly, both the believing and unbelieving Jews, or the godly and wicked of them, both descended from the same national original. And, to back this observation, it is observable, that, whereas our Saviour maketh his metaphor of wheat and tares, because he would only show the difference betwixt the righteous and the wicked,—the Baptist doth his of wheat and chaff, because he would not only show the same difference in condition, but also their agreement and identity in nation.

§ “*The wheat he will gather.*”

By ‘wheat’ and ‘chaff,’ might very well be understood, true and false doctrine; and the rather, because the Scripture elsewhere calleth them by such terms^s, and maketh the fire of the word of God, the trier and touchstone of them both^t:—and the rather still, because the words are spoken to Pharisees and Sadducees, which were both very erroneous in their tenets. But it will be very harsh to apply the gathering into the garner, and the unquenchableness of the fire, in reference to doctrine; therefore, the two different titles are, severally and properly, to be understood, of righteous and wicked men’s persons, differenced in those their several qualifications: and, under this interpretation, may the truth or falsity of doctrine be also understood.—Now, the righteous, or saints of God, are fitly compared to wheat, in divers respects; as in goodness, usefulness, weight, and fulness; whereas, the wicked, on the contrary, are like chaff, in being refuse, vile, unprofitable, light, empty, and fittest for the fire.

§ “*He will gather.*”

The observation is not far amiss, especially the significance and force of the Greek word regarded, that from

^s Jer. xxiii. 28.

^t 1 Cor. iii. 12, 13, 15, from Deut. xxxiii. 2.

hence inferreth, that the righteous lie, scatteredly and dispersedly, among the wicked.—But the word ‘gathering,’ doth not always necessarily import so much,—for a leper was said to be gathered, when he was cleansed, 2 Kings v. 3^u; which was not from amongst men, but unto them: and the manner of speech here, seemeth to be taken from the gathering of harvest, or ripe fruits^v; or, from the gathering of dying men unto their rest^w.

§ “*Into the garner.*”

Seeing that the main intent of the verse is to show forth the destruction of Jerusalem, as is proved before,—by these words might well be understood, the care and charge that God took of his faithful ones in that ruin, when, by the warning of a voice in the temple, that said, ‘Migremus hinc, ‘let us flit hence,’—he removed them to Pella, a place far enough distant from the danger;—but that our Saviour hath taught us to understand it of the rest in heaven, in his parable of the wheat and tares^x.

SECTION X.

Christ installed into his Ministry by Baptism, and by the unction of the Holy Ghost. His Pedigree by his Mother, Mary.

MATT. III.

Ver. 13. “THEN cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan, unto John, to be baptized of him.

14. But John forbade him, saying, ‘I have need to be baptized of thee: and comest thou to me?’

15. And Jesus answering said unto him, ‘Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.’ Then he suffered him.

16. And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him:

17. And lo, a voice from heaven, saying, ‘This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.’

MARK, I.

Ver. 9. “AND it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth in Galilee, and was baptized of John in Jordan.

^u יאסף ארץ

^v Exod. xxiii. 16.

^w As Gen. xxv. 8. 17.

^x Matt. xiii.

10. And straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens opened, and the Spirit, like a dove, descending upon him :

11. And there came a voice from heaven, saying, 'Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.'

LUKE, III.

Ver. 21. "Now when all the people were baptized, it came to pass, that Jesus also being baptized, and praying, the heaven was opened,

22. And the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him, and a voice came from heaven, which said, 'Thou art my beloved Son ; in thee I am well pleased.'

23. And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age, being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli,

24. Which was the son of Matthat, which was the son of Levi, which was the son of Melchi, which was the son of Janna, which was the son of Joseph,

25. Which was the son of Mattathias, which was the son of Amos, which was the son of Naum, which was the son of Esli, which was the son of Nagge,

26. Which was the son of Maath, which was the son of Mattathias, which was the son of Semei, which was the son of Joseph, which was the son of Juda,

27. Which was the son of Joanna, which was the son of Rhesa, which was the son of Zorobabel, which was the son of Salathiel, which was the son of Neri,

28. Which was the son of Melchi, which was the son of Addi, which was the son of Cosam, which was the son of Elmodam, which was the son of Er,

29. Which was the son of Jose, which was the son of Eliezer, which was the son of Jorim, which was the son of Matthat, which was the son of Levi,

30. Which was the son of Simeon, which was the son of Juda, which was the son of Joseph, which was the son of Jonan, which was the son of Eliakim,

31. Which was the son of Melea, which was the son of Menan, which was the son of Mattatha, which was the son of Nathan, which was the son of David,

32. Which was the son of Jesse, which was the son of Obed, which was the son of Booz, which was the son of Salmon, which was the son of Naasson,

33. Which was the son of Aminadab, which was the son of Aram, which was the son of Esrom, which was the son of Phares, which was the son of Juda,

34. Which was the son of Jacob, which was the son of Isaac, which was the son of Abraham, which was the son of Thara, which was the son of Nachor,

35. Which was the son of Saruch, which was the son of Ragau, which the son of Phalec, which was the son of Heber, which was the son of Sala,

36. Which was the son of Cainan, which was the son of Arphaxad, which was the son of Sem, which was the son of Noah, which was the son of Lamech,

37. Which was the son of Mathusala, which was the son of Enoch, which was the son of Jared, which was the son of Maleleel, which was the son of Cainan,

38. Which was the son of Enos, which was the son of Seth, which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God."

Reason of the Order.

There can be doubt, or scruple, about the subsequency of the beginning of this section, to that that was next before: for the three evangelists have so unanimously ranked them together, that the order needeth no more confirmation. But, about this latter part, or the genealogy of Christ, there is something more difficult. For some harmonists have brought this line of Luke, and that of Matthew together; some bringing Matthew's hither with Luke's to Christ's baptism,—and others, this of Luke, to the time of Matthew's, to Christ's birth. But, as the evangelists have laid them asunder, so are they to be kept asunder, and to be disposed in the harmony according as they lie: for pregnant reasons may be given, why the two have laid them at times so far distant. Why Matthew, at our Saviour's birth, the reasons were given there, in their proper place; and why Luke, at his baptism, may be the better seen, by looking on the promise^y; "The seed of the woman shall break the head of the serpent." Matthew wrote his Gospel chiefly for the Jews; and, therefore, it was necessary for him to show and approve Jesus for the Messias by his pedigree, which was the manifest and the chiefest thing that nation looked after, for the judging of the true Christ: this he doth, therefore, at the story of his birth, and

^y Gen. iii. 15.

beginneth it from Abraham, who was the ‘ultima analysis,’ or the farthest that they cared to look after, as concerning his descent. But Luke, a companion of the doctor of the Gentiles in all his travels, writeth his Gospel for the Gentiles, as well as for the Jews: and, therefore, he showeth Christ’s descent at the story of that time, at which he was first born towards the Gentiles; that is, at his revelation at his baptism, from whence he first began to preach the gospel. The first words of the promise, “the seed of the woman,” the evangelist sweetly expoundeth in this genealogy; showing, through seventy-five descents, that he was the seed of the woman, promised to Adam in the garden; and, therefore, he draweth his line from Adam, in whose loins the Gentiles were, for whom he writeth as well as the Jews, when the promise was made. The latter words, “shall break the head of the serpent,” begin to take place from the baptism of Christ and forward: and, first, in his victory against Satan’s temptations, which is the very next story that the evangelist handleth,—and then in his preaching of the gospel, the power of which must destroy the kingdom of Satan, from that time forward.

HARMONY AND EXPLANATION.

Matt. iii. 13: “*Then Jesus cometh.*”

The tabernacle in the wilderness was six months current in working and preparing for, before it was finished and set up. For, on the tenth day of the month Tisri, which answereth to part of our September,—Moses cometh down from his third fast of forty days, and bringeth with him the glad tidings of God’s reconciliation to his people, and, in sign thereof, the renewed tables, and the welcome command to make the tabernacle. From that time forward, the working and offerings for the making of the sanctuary began, and, six months after, it was finished, and erected,—namely, in the month of Abib². So long a time was the Baptist conceived, and born, before the conception and birth of our Saviour^a; and so long a time did he preach, and baptize, and prepare for the great building of the gospel, before our Saviour himself came, and, by his own baptism and preaching, reared it up. For, as our Saviour was baptized and entered into his ministerial function, when he began to be thirty

² Exod. xl.

^a Luke, i. 26.

years of age; and that, according to a legal ordinance, as shall be showed ere long,—so, likewise, did the Baptist begin to preach, when he began to be thirty, which was six months current before. And this may be the better supposed, if it be but considered how great multitudes were baptized of John before the baptism of Christ, and how far he travelled up and down to preach. Of the latter, Luke^b witnesseth thus; “And he came into all the region round about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance.” And Matthew of the former, thus; “There went out unto him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him:”—a space of ground not to be travelled over, with resting in many places by the way,—and a number of people, not to be baptized in a short space of time.

Now the reasons, why Christ, that needed no cleansing, being purity itself, would be baptized, are given divers:—

As, first, That, by this symbol, he might enter himself into the society and fraternity of the Christians, as by circumcision he did of the Jews: like a king [it is Jansenius’s comparison], that, to unite and endear himself to any city of his subjects, condescendeth to be made a freeman of it, as are the ordinary citizens.

Secondly, That he might bear witness to the preaching and baptism of John, and might receive testimony from him again.

Thirdly, That, by his own baptism, he might sanctify the waters of baptism to his church.

Fourthly, That he might give example himself, of the performance of that, which he enjoined to others,—and, by his own coming to be baptized, teach others, not to refuse that sacrament.

Fifthly, That he might receive testimony from heaven, that he was the Son of God.

Sixthly, That he might occasion the revealing of the Trinity.

Seventhly, That he might show the descending of the Holy Ghost on the waters of baptism.

But, eighthly, The main reason of all, and that which is equal to these all, is that which is given by Christ himself,—namely, that ‘he might fulfil all righteousness;’ of which anon.

^b Chap. iii. 3.

Ver. 14: "*But John forbade him.*"

So Peter forbade Christ to wash his feet; not in any surly frowardness, but in a holy humility, having an eye upon his own unworthiness. This refusal of John, being of the same nature, seemeth to have had respect to three things, according to the several persons there present,—Christ, the people, and himself.

First, In regard of Christ, because he needeth no baptism, in that he needed neither repentance nor remission of sins.

Secondly, In regard of the people, lest they might mistake, and, seeing Christ baptized, as well as they, might judge him sinful as well as themselves.

Thirdly, In regard of the Baptist himself, who had told the people so oft, and so constantly, of him that came after him, that he was greater than he,—and that his baptism was more excellent than his: and how would this cross that testimony of his, in the eyes and hearts of the people, when they should see him, as an inferior, come to be baptized of John! But,

Fourthly, and chiefly, This his reluctancy proceeded from his true and right comparing of Christ and himself together,—the majesty and purity of him, with the baseness and sinfulness of himself: and, therefore, he saith, "I have need to be baptized of thee," &c; not refusing the service, nor crossing the will of Christ, but confessing the unworthiness of himself, and ponderating the inequality of the persons.

But it may, not unfitly nor unseasonably, be questioned here, how the Baptist knew that this was Christ, seeing that he saith himself, "I knew him not; but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, On whomsoever thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and abiding on him, the same is he that baptizeth with the Holy Ghost^c." Now, the descending of the Holy Ghost was after he was baptized; and these words, "I have need to be baptized of thee," were spoken before. To this doubt and scruple many answers are given, but not so many resolutions:—

First, Some take the words, "I knew him not," &c. to be spoken by John, to make his testimony to be without suspicion: for John and Jesus being akin by birth [for their mothers were cousins, Luke i. 36], it might be surmised, that John gave so high and large a testimony of him for kindred

^c John, i. 33.

and affection's sake; therefore, he protesteth that he knew him not in any such a way, but only by divine revelation. Thus Chrysostom and Theophylact. In which answer, if there be any satisfaction at all, which is but little,—yet is it not to our whole query, but only to the least part of it.

Secondly, Some thus,—that John, before his baptism, knew that he was the Christ; but not that it was he that should baptize with the Holy Ghost, and with fire, till he saw the Spirit descend upon him:—and thus Theophylact again; and upon this he fixeth, as on the most genuine and proper resolution, which is very hard to apprehend or collect out of the words of John, in his whole sermon: for this maketh him to distinguish betwixt Christ, and him that should baptize with the Holy Ghost, and to make them two distinct persons in his opinion; whereas, both his own words, and, no doubt, the expectation of the people, did take him for one and the same, to be Christ.

Thirdly, Their opinion is yet far more strange, that think that the Baptist took not Christ for Christ, when he gainsayeth his being baptized by him, but for some extraordinary holy man,—and continued in this opinion, till the descending of the Holy Ghost confirmed him in the truth, that he was the Messiah. For it is not imaginable, that John, having the peculiar commission from God, to baptize all that should come unto him, should himself desire to be baptized by another man. And again, his words, “I have need to be baptized by thee,” show, that he understood that it was he that baptized with the Holy Ghost; as will appear by and by.

Fourthly, Little less improper, and equally strained, is the exposition of Austin; that John knew, indeed, that he was the Christ, and that it was he that should baptize with the Holy Ghost,—but, till he saw the descending of the Holy Ghost, he knew not that it was *only he* that should baptize with the Holy Ghost; or, that he reserved the propriety of the power of baptizing to himself alone, and did not communicate it to his ministers. And this propriety, the schools make to consist in these four particulars:—1. That he reserved to himself the power of instituting baptism, though he communicated the power of baptism to others. 2. That he can confer the grace or effect of baptism, without the administration of the sacrament; which the ministers cannot. 3. That he giveth efficacy to baptism by his death. 4. That

baptism is administered and given in his name. Which gloss, as the father strained out of the text, to retort upon the Donatists, that maintained that this sacrament, administered by a wicked minister, availed nothing,—so is it but strained, and that strangely too: for how can it possibly be collected, that John should collect any such thing from the descending of the Holy Ghost?

Fifthly, More plausible is their resolution, that hold that John knew Christ, indeed, in some measure, before his baptism, but not so fully as after, when the Holy Ghost descended. But,

Sixthly, A plenary and sufficient satisfaction to the question, may be had by these three observations:—

First, That John, though he knew the mystery of the incarnation of the Messias, and his excellent and divine graces, and that he was near at hand,—yet had never seen his face till now, nor knew he him by sight, till he came to be baptized.

Secondly, That then he knew him by a present revelation, as Samuel knew Saul^d. For if, in his mother's womb, he leaped at the approach of Christ in the womb of his mother,—much more may it be conceived, that, by the revelation of the Spirit, he knew him and acknowledged him now.

Thirdly, That the sign which was given him, when he began to baptize, “On whomsoever thou shalt see the Holy Ghost descend,” &c. was not given him for his first knowledge of Christ, but for the confirmation of that knowledge that he had of him before: and for his assurance and confidence to point him out unto the people. And such a one was the sign given to Moses^e; not for his first instruction, that he was sent by God, but for his confirmation in that wherein he was before instructed; nor that neither so much for himself, as for the people.

§ “*I have need to be baptized of thee.*”

He meaneth not, with the baptism of water, which he himself administered to others, but with the baptism of the Holy Ghost. For, first, Christ himself baptized none with water at all^f; but referred the administration of this sacrament to others.

Secondly, The baptism, wherewith he baptized, was of

^d 1 Sam. ix. 15. 17.

^e Exod. iii. 12.

^f John, iv. 2.

the Holy Ghost, ver. 11; and it cannot be doubted, that, when John speaketh of being baptized by Christ, he meaneth the proper baptism, wherewith Christ baptized.

Thirdly, It is not consonant to reason, that John should complain of the want of that, which he so plentifully afforded unto others: but though he himself were not baptized in water, yet his special deputation from God, to be the first and chief baptized, made that he needed it not.

Fourthly, Be it granted that John speaketh of baptizing with water, as some commentators would have it, yet are not his words to be understood, simply, of any absolute necessity that he had of baptism, but comparatively betwixt him and Christ, that it it was fitter that he should be baptized by Christ, than Christ by him. For so the phrase, ‘I have need,’ is used,—not always to import necessity, but sometimes conveniency. And so doth the rabbinical word צָרִיךְ indifferently signify, and divers words that signify ‘necessity’ in other tongues.

Ver. 15: “*Suffer it to be so now.*”

The emphasis of this clause is held to be in the word *now*: as showing, that howsoever Christ was the Son of God, and should, in time, reveal himself mightily so to be^s, yet *now* the time required, that that his glory should be veiled under his humiliation,—and his divinity concealed, till its proper season to be revealed. This exposition is as current as any among expositors; how substantial, let the reader judge. For,

First, The baptizing of Christ by John, was not so great a means to veil his divinity, as it was to reveal it: for then he had the testimony from heaven, that he was the Son of God.

Secondly, There needeth no other reason to be looked after, why Christ saith, “Suffer it to be so now,” than what he himself giveth, in the very next words following; “For thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.” The word *now*, as it lieth in the English, might be taken for the sense of נָא or עֵתָה, so ordinary in the Hebrew, words of entreating or persuasion; and might very well also suit with that sense here, if the LXX translated them by the Greek word here used, ἀπὸ, but they do not: therefore, may we the more justly suppose the word to be emphatical in some respect; and the

* As Rom. i. 4.

respect seemeth to be this : Whereas John had told the people before of Christ's baptizing with the Holy Ghost, and had told Christ, in the verse preceding, that he had need of that baptism,—to that it is that our Saviour giveth this answer, “Suffer it to be so now ;” as meaning thus : ‘That it was true, indeed, that he was he that should come after him, and he that should baptize with the Holy Ghost, of which baptism, John had more need from him than he of John's: yet the time of that his baptizing was not yet come ; for, first, must he fulfil all the righteousness required of himself, before he was to pour out or bestow that baptism of the Spirit upon others : and, therefore, must John suffer him to be baptized *now* with the baptism of water ; for that baptism of his with the Spirit was not yet to be exhibited.’

§ “*For thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.*”

The greatest doubt and difficulty in this clause is, what our Saviour meaneth here by ‘righteousness ;’ which being resolved upon, the other smaller words, and less scrupulous, in it, will offer themselves the more readily to be understood.

First, Hilary, though somewhat obscurely, seemeth to construe it of the righteousness of the law ; “For by him (saith he), all righteousness was to be fulfilled, by whom alone the law could be fulfilled.”

Secondly, But Jerome speaks it out more plainly and fully, and understandeth it of all righteousness of the law and of nature ;—either of which, indeed, were not an improper gloss to be applied unto Christ alone ; but since the word *us*, joineth the Baptist also in the same fulfilling with him, it is not safe to understand it of all the righteousness of the law ; because it is not pious to hold John the accomplisher of it, as well as he.

Thirdly, Theophylact, and some others with him, go the same way with these fathers named, but they go somewhat farther ; for they add, that Christ had fulfilled all the law already, but only in this one particular of being baptized ; and, when he had performed that, he had completed all righteousness.—But the word *us*, spoileth this exposition, as well as it did that before : and it will be some work to prove, that baptism, taken in its proper sense, or as John administered it, was any part of the law, that Christ was to fulfil.

Fourthly, Others descant upon the words literally, and

take righteousness for justice distributive, and baptism for a special part or act of it: "For he that is baptized (saith Ludolphus), pleaseth God, pitieth his own soul, and edifieth his neighbour by his example; and so fulfilleth all justice, in that he doth to God, himself, and his neighbour, what he ought." An encomium of baptism, and a new invention of fulfilling the law, which, I suppose, was never dreamed of before.

Fifthly, To omit other expositions much like this, which some have given, not near to the text, nor truth,—Jansenius, and some with him, but not so largely as he, do paraphrase it thus:—"According as I, by an humble submission, desire to be baptized by thee, so it becometh us, because we are sent of God the Father, to call men away from all unrighteousness, and to teach the people, to fulfil and perform, in work, whatsoever is right,—omitting nothing, be it never so little, which we know to be agreeable to the will of God. Therefore he importeth not, that, by the receiving of baptism, all righteousness is fulfilled; but that, by them, that are masters and teachers of all righteousness, nothing is to be passed over, which is right,—although they be not bound thereto by necessity, and though the thing itself seem never so small." Which exposition, though it be good and sound in regard of the truth contained in it, yet seemeth it not to be punctual and seasonable for this place. For whereas the very marrow and pith of it lieth in this,—that Christ and John, being teachers of the people, must practise themselves, what they teach others to practise; and, therefore, must Christ be baptized, for example to others: let the reader judge whether the inference be good, by this,—that John himself was never baptized: and, consequently, whether the application of such a sense to these words, be fitting and agreeable.

Sixthly, Chemnitius yet goeth nearer the text and the mark, and bringeth the word 'righteousness' to reflect upon men: explaining it thus:—"That since Christ came to confer and apply righteousness to men, and, accordingly, to sanctify every thing and means, that might conduce to convey the same unto them; therefore, would he thus consecrate baptism by his own being baptized, and give vigour to it to be a seal and strengthener of righteousness and grace begun: and in this sense, he saith, that it becometh him to

fulfil all righteousness, or every thing whereby the righteousness of man may be forwarded and promoted: and because John was the minister of baptism,—therefore, in the word *us*, he joineth him also in the fulfilling with him.” To this purpose he, and far more largely, coming as close to the mark, as any we meet with; and yet, if I judge aright, not so close as to hit it in these two respects:—

First, In that he seemeth to hold, and so also do many others with him, that Christ’s performance of the several parts of righteousness, personally in himself, was requisite to the sanctifying of such things to others; whereas his very institution of any such a thing, giveth validity sufficient to it, without his own actual example. As in this very thing in hand concerning baptism,—if Christ instituted that, in the hand of John, for a sacrament, to continue in his church for ever, I cannot see what virtue, vigour, or efficacy, his being baptized by John added to it, more than his institution of it before had done, save only for the more sensible reverence of it in the eyes of the people.

Secondly, and chiefly, Because it is harsh and bold, to conceive, that Christ, in the performance of any thing, that might tend to man’s justification, should take a man to be a sharer and co-worker in such equality, as the words *thus* and *us* do make the Baptist.

By ‘righteousness,’ therefore, in this place, may rather be understood, the equity and justice of the law, and Christ’s fulfilling of the same. Not the moral, for that opinion we refused before,—but the other parts of it, which were either prophetical, or figurative and typical. Not denying his fulfilling the moral law neither; for that he performed to a tittle, being without the least taint of sin, either in thought, word, or deed; but rather illustrating and setting forth his performance of that the more, in that he was also so punctual to fulfil the other parts of the law, which were less material. And to this exposition of ‘righteousness,’ namely, for the equity of the ceremonial or typical law, not only the matter or thing in hand itself, but even every word also, that is in this clause, do give their consent and confirmation.

For, first, if we look upon the ceremonial law itself, and the reason why it was given, we shall find that it was neither so exact and exquisite in regard of its injunctions, nor so strict or necessary to be performed in itself according to the

letter, as it was in regard of its significancy of good things to come; the force and virtue of it consisting not so much in its very verbal precepts, and corporal observances, as in its representative and typical predictions and foreshowing of some better things to come thereafter. And, howsoever those rites and ceremonies had their obedience in the practices of the Jews, yet their equity and very intent, indeed, they had not, but in the fulfilling of Christ.

Secondly; If we look also upon baptism, which was the matter now in agitation, and the baptism of Christ also; how they were both fully and plainly prefigured under legal rites and ceremonious observances, *was showed before*^h.

Thirdly; It was requisite that Christ should fulfil the ceremonial law, as well as the moral, in some kind of necessity, though not as much for the one as for the other. For as the moral was a law of faith, so also was the ceremonial a law of hope; as the judicial was also of charity. In the moral law, it was showed to man what he was to do; but withal he saw, by the same law, his own disability and impossibility of performing what was to be done. The sight of this driveth man to lay hold of Christ, that performed that law for him; and thus the law, though it be, according to the letter, a message of death,—yet, in the spirit, it is a doctrine of faith unto life. The Jew being thus entered, by the moral law, into the school of faith, then came in the ceremonial, and was as an usher of hope: for by those rites and legal observations, the memory of Christ's coming was continually kept fresh,—and the eye and expectation, and the fruit and application, of his performance of the moral law for the good of men, daily read in those typical and shadowed lectures.—As, therefore, it was absolutely necessary, that Christ should fulfil the moral law in regard of all men,—so was it respectively necessary, that he should answer and accomplish the ceremonial, in regard of the Jew. For if the outward observance thereof were for nothing so much, as to lead his eye and expectation to Christ, and the very life and equity thereof were included in him,—how necessary was it, for the sake of that people, and for confirmation both to them and all others, that he, who was Christ that was to come, should

^h *Was showed before.*] “Si Baptismum in genere, de quo nunc agitur, respiciamus, et speciatim illum Christi; utrumque legalibus istis ritibus dudum fuisse præfiguratum, *infra demonstrabimus* :” Leusden. [See page 278. ED.]

fulfil that part of the law, as well as the other : at the least, how fitting. And so he saith, in the place in hand ; “ Thus it becometh us to fulfil all the equity of the ceremonial law.” Now the ceremony, to which our Saviour looketh in these words, was the washing of the priests in water, when they entered into their functionⁱ; the equity of which appeared in him, when he was baptized at his entrance into his ministry. And this, indeed, was the manifest and properest end and reason of Christ’s being baptized; namely, that, by baptism, he might be installed into his ministerial office.

Luke, iii. 21 : “ *Now when all the people were baptized,*” &c.

Not all that were to be baptized by John,—for the contrary is evident, John iii. 23; where John is baptizing a twelve-month after this; but all those that were reckoned by the evangelist before, from Jerusalem and Judea, of Pharisees, Sadducees, publicans, and soldiers, which he now reckoneth up in this ‘summa totalis’ of ‘all the people,’ to show what multitudes were baptized into Christ, before Christ came to be revealed.

But it may be questioned, among all this number, whether there were any women baptized by John, or no. And the doubt may seem to be equally balanced; for, as the silence of the text doth seem to deny it, so reason, on the other side, doth strongly affirm it.

For, first, the baptism of John was such a thing, as women might receive as well as men, in regard of possibility; which they could not possibly do by circumcision.

Secondly; It was such a thing as they might receive as well as men, in regard of capability; for women were as ready to repent, as they.

But, thirdly, that which putteth it out of all doubt, that women were baptized by him, is the testimony of our Saviour^j; “ John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not; but the publicans and the *harlots* believed him.”

§ “ *Jesus also being baptized.*”

About the time, place, and manner, of our Saviour’s baptism, the evangelists have been so silent in this place, that what is to be resolved upon them, is to be fetched from and

ⁱ Exod. xxix. 4; Lev. viii. 6.

^j Matt. xxi. 32.

by comparison of other texts, and collection from other places; which, about the first, will give very full satisfaction,—about the second, indifferent,—and, about the last, little or none at all. The time, then, of his being baptized, that is, the time of the year, is only, or at least chiefly, to be found, by computing the time or length of his preaching, and therewith considering the time or season of his death. Now the length of his preaching, or from his baptism to his death, was justly and exactly three years and a half, as was touched before: and from that very thing, or in relation to it, that number is so very renowned in Scripture, being sometimes expressed in the plain terms, of “three years and six months^k”; sometimes, by “half a week^l”; sometimes, by a “time, times, and half a time^m”; and sometimes, by “a thousand two hundred and threescore daysⁿ”; and sometimes, by “forty-and-two months^o.” To evidence which account of his ministry, first, may be produced the text of Daniel alleged instantly before, chap. ix. 27; where it is said, that ‘Messias should confirm the covenant for many for one week:’ or, ‘in that one week’ rather,—namely, which he reckoneth the last of the seventy: for, first, he nameth seven weeks by themselves, and then sixty-two by themselves, ver. 25; which every one knoweth made sixty-nine: and then coming to speak of the last week which was to make up the seventy, he saith, that ‘in that one week,’ Christ shall confirm the covenant for many: and then, describing and declaring the exact time of that his work, he saith, “And in half that week shall he cause sacrifice and oblation to cease.”

Now, that by these weeks are meant weeks of years, or as many years as a week hath days, hardly any man ever denied, or suspected the contrary: and that, then, by half a week, is meant ‘half seven years,’ or ‘three years and a half,’—there can be as little doubt or scruple. This, then, the angel Gabriel telleth, was the exact time in which the Messias did confirm the covenant, and was bringing to an end sacrificing and other ceremonies, or the time of his preaching the gospel,—which was from his baptism to his death.

Secondly; If not for proof, yet, for better illustration of

^k Luke, iv. 25.^l Dan. ix. 27.^m Dan. xii. 7; Rev. xii. 14.ⁿ Rev. xi. 3; and xii. 6.^o Rev. xi. 2.

the same, may be produced that place of the gospel alleged so lately also, before; namely, Luke iv. 25; where Elias is a glorious type and resemblance of Christ, in a sweet and harmonious discord and difference. For, as he shut up heaven by his prayer, and there was no rain for three years and six months,—so Christ opened heaven at his baptism, as it is said in the verse in hand, and continued to distil the divine dew and rain of his heavenly doctrine^o, for the same space of time.

And, thirdly, As there is such evidence for the time averred, from a prophecy, and such illustration from a type,—so is there a full confirmation of it in the evangelical story. For John hath plainly parcelled out the three years, by four Passovers; as the first, chap. ii. 13; the second, chap. v. 1; the third, chap. vi. 4; and the fourth, chap. xiii. 1, &c: and the odd half year [which, since he died at the last Passover, must be laid before the first] was taken up in these particulars,—of his journey into the wilderness, and forty days' fast^p; his return to Jordan, and abode thereabout^q; his voyage into Galilee, and miracle at Cana^r; his removal, after some space, to Capernaum, and some abode in it^s; and thence his journey to Jerusalem, to the first Passover of the four^t. So that, it being thus apparent, that the length or space of his preaching was three years and a half, from his baptizing to his suffering, it being, withal, considered, that he died at Easter,—it will readily follow, that he was baptized half a year before that time of the year; namely, in the month Tisri, or September. And, it being again considered, that he was baptized, when he was just entering upon a new year of his age, as shall be observed anon,—it will thence, likewise, follow, that he was born at the same time of the year also. And who is he that can imagine, that the renownedness and fame of this month in the Old Testament, both before the law and under it, was for any other thing so much as in reference and prefiguration to, and of, these glorious things?

Now, though there be these assured evidences of the time of the year, when our Saviour was baptized, yet is there but conjecture of the time of the month. And that may most constantly be conceived to have been at the feast of tabernacles, which began on the fifteenth day of the month^u,

^o As Deut. xxxii. 2.

^p Matt. iv. 1.

^q John, i. 29. 35. 44.

^r John, ii. 1.

^s Chap. ii. 12.

^t John, ii. 13.

^u Levit. xxiii. 33.

upon these probable, and not altogether unsatisfactory, reasons :—

First ; Because he died on the fifteenth day of the month Abib, or Nisan, the day after the Passover ; and, to make the odd half year, spoken of before, an exact and just half year indeed, his baptism must be fixed on the fifteenth of Tisri.

Secondly ; The two other of the three solemn festivals, the Passover and Pentecost, Christ accomplished, or fulfilled what they signified, by his death at the one, and by the giving of the Holy Ghost at the other ; and there is no reason to think the third, or the feast of tabernacles, any less figurative, or typical, than the other ; and as little to think, that he should leave the equity of that unsatisfied more than the other ; and if he answered not that in his birth and baptism, he answered it in nothing at all.

Thirdly ; The very nature of the feast of tabernacles, and the occasion and reason of its institution, have a forcible reference to such a thing. For though Moses hath given but this reason for one custom and practice which they used in the feast, “ Ye shall dwell in booths seven days, that your generations may know that I made the children of Israel to dwell in booths, when I brought them out of the land of Egypt^v ;” yet had the original and institution of the feast a great deal more in it. For the main occasion was this :—Moses having, after long fasting and prayer, made the peace of Israel with God about the golden calf, and having obtained the tables renewed, which himself had broken, and regained the commission to build the tabernacle, which had been suspended because of that sin ; on the tenth day of the month Tisri [which, according to our account, was about the two or three-and-twentieth day of our September], he coming down from the mount, bringeth these glad tidings of peace and reconciliation to the people, for which that day was observed for the day of reconciliation, or expiation, ever after. And the people, now hearing that they must make the tabernacle, in which God would dwell among them, and that they must not remove from the place where they were, viz. from mount Sinai, till that be finished, —they then addressed themselves to pitch their tents, and make them booths for their winter-abode there, and instantly fall upon the work of the sanctuary ; and this was it

^v Levit. xxiii. 42, 43.

that was the occasion of that solemn feast in succeeding times. Now, let the substance be laid unto the shadow, and the antitype and figure brought together, and the application is not only sweet, but also somewhat evincing. For, since the occasion of that feast, was God's coming to dwell among the people in his tabernacle, and that now first begun or exhibited, and this just half a year after their first delivery from Egypt,—observe how fully these are answered in Christ's showing himself to the world at his baptism, in whom God dwelleth among men; and this the first revelation of him to the world; and this just half a year since John began to publish the delivery of men from the bondage of sin and Satan, by the preaching of the gospel.

Fourthly; The consecration of the temple of Solomon was at this very time; namely, in the seventh month, or the month Ethanim, which is all one with Tisri, and thence the service of it began^w. Now, since Christ himself averreth, that the temple was a figure of his body^x, we may follow the allegory with the more boldness, and apply the dedication of that, and the time of the dedication, to his consecration by baptism to his ministerial service, and parallel them both in the very same time.

Secondly; The certain and determinate place, where our Saviour was baptized, cannot absolutely be fixed and resolved upon by any warrant of Scripture; though many have been so confident as to point it out, and to show a cross, set in the very place of the river, and miraculous curing of lepers in the water. The evangelists have given no more settlement of it than this,—that it was in Judea, and that it was in Jordan. Two circumstances the more remarkable,—

First; Because that, after that baptism of our Saviour, we cannot certainly find John baptizing, either in the same country, or in the same river, ever again. For, whereas there is mention of his being, about six weeks after this, in Bethabara^y, that was both on the other side Jordan, and it was a water different from Jordan^z; and of his baptizing in Enon, a whole twelvemonth after this^a,—that was, also, out of the precincts of Judea, and distant somewhat from the banks of Jordan; and the waters there, the waters of the place itself, and not of that river. And this sheweth the

^w 1 Kings, viii. 2.

^x John, ii.

^y John, i. 28.

^z Judg. vii. 24.

^a John, iii. 23.

reason more plainly, why Luke, in the clause next before this that we have in hand, summeth up the baptism of all the people, before he speaks of our Saviour's; because, that there were now collected, out of Judea, all the harvest of believers, that might be gathered in by the preaching of John,—and when Christ was baptized, John was to remove to another place.

Secondly; From this, that Christ was baptized of John in Jordan, and in Judea, it will almost inevitably follow, that he was baptized in the place where the river was dried up, and the Israelites first entered into the land of Canaan. For, if it be considered, 1. That the army marched through the channel in two main bodies, the one on the one side of the ark,—and the other, on the other: 2. That either of these main bodies were two miles distant from the ark on either side, and, consequently, four miles from each other: 3. That these two great squadrons consisting, either of them, of so very many thousands, marched in an extraordinary breadth, because they were to pass over in a reasonable time,—it will follow, hereupon, even past all denial, that this, their passage, took up all the length of Jordan, that it had in Judea, or very near it; so that the place we seek for is within this compass: and by this we may observe the substance sweetly answering to the figure, and way made through the waters of Jordan, to the heavenly Canaan, by baptism, in the very same place where there was to the earthly, by its drying up.

Thirdly; The manner of his baptizing differed not from the common manner, that John used with others, save in one particular: for he went into the water, had water sprinkled on him, and prayed, as well as they; but whether John used the same form of words in baptizing of him, that he did to the other, or some other, or none at all, is some question or scruple. The least is of the first; for it may be readily resolved, that he baptized not him in the same words that he did the others;—because he then should have baptized him in his own name; which who can imagine? and into him, or in his name, which was to come; which had been to have pointed out another Christ. Betwixt the two latter the scales are balancing; and they weigh so even, that it is not much material which way your allowance doth turn them; for the query itself is of far more curiosity than necessity.

For why might not John baptize him in varied words? As, 'I baptize thee with water to the preaching of the gospel;' or, why might he not baptize him without any words at all,—since he received baptism, not so much for a sacrament, as for satisfaction of the typical law? Let the reader's judgment weigh down the scale.

Matt. iii. 16: "*He went up straight out of the water.*"

The invention of auricular confession hath invented a strange exposition of this clause. For the rest of the people, say some, standing in the waters, I know not how deep, after they were baptized, confessed their sins unto John before they came out, being detained there by him, until they had so done; but Christ, because he had no sin, needed no such confession; and, therefore, he came suddenly out of the water after he was baptized:—a gloss that includeth impossibilities. For neither was it possible that so great multitudes should be baptized in so short a time, if every one made a singular confession of their sins to John; nor was it possible, that John should endure so long in the water, as this work would require, and never come out; for if they stood up to the neck in the river, I cannot think but that he also stood some deepness in the water. But this speedy coming of our Saviour out of the water after he was baptized, is expressed by the evangelist, only to show how near and close the opening of the heavens was to his baptizing,—namely, that it was almost in the very same instant, as Mark explaineth it; "And straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens opened," &c.

Luke, iii. 21: "*And praying.*"

This, it seemeth, was the manner of those that were baptized,—as soon as they were baptized, to come up out of the water and pray; and this explaineth that before, about confessing their sins, that it was not to John, but to God, as soon as they came out of the water. Now since Christ had no sins to confess of his own, the tenor of his prayer tended to another purpose. If we think it was for the glory of God, for the conversion of many by his ministry, which he was now beginning,—for the preservation of the elect, and the sanctifying of the church, and the like,—we think not much amiss, since we find his prayers in other places to be made

and tendered to the same effect. But it seemeth rather, that his prayer, at this time, was for what followed upon his prayer, the sending down of the Holy Ghost, and the glorifying of him by a testimony from heaven. For, first, the text hath laid his prayer, and the opening of the heavens, so closely, and so consonantly withal together, “Jesus praying the heavens were opened,”—as that it seemeth to point out, what was the tenor of his prayer, by the consequent upon it.

Secondly; In another place^a, there is the like return, upon the like prayer; “Father, glorify thy name; there came therefore a voice from heaven,” &c.

Thirdly; It being considered, that our Saviour was to enter now upon the great work of redemption, and the preaching of the gospel,—it will be the less strange to conceive, that he prayed for the visible sealing of him, to that work and office by the Holy Ghost, and for a testimony of him, that he was the Messias.

Matt. iii. 16: “*Lo, the heavens were opened.*”

There is no material difference in the thing, though Luke hath put ‘the heaven’ in the singular number,—and Matthew, ‘the heavens,’ in the plural; for one followeth the idiom of the Hebrews, and the other of the Greeks. For the Hebrews cannot call the heaven by its proper name, but in the plural or dual number שמים, ‘heavens:’ but the Greeks can in the singular. And so little doth the Syriac make of this difference of number in the two evangelists, that he translateth it just cross,—Matthew’s plural in the singular, and Luke’s singular in the plural.

About the opening of the heavens, or the manner of the same, as it is of far more consequence to inquire, so it is of difficulty to resolve, because of diversity of opinions and probabilities several ways:—

First; Some deny the opening of the heavens at all, but understand, that Christ saw them opened, and the Holy Ghost descending intellectually only, or by spiritual vision, as Ezekiel^b saw the heavens opened. But this exposition is very improper; for John saw the same also; and the descending of the Holy Ghost was in a bodily shape, and not imaginary; and the voice was articulate and audible, and not visionary.

^a John, xii. 28.

^b Chap. i. 2.

Secondly ; Others deny also the opening of the heavens, but with another manner of evasion and exposition. ‘ For there was (say they) no scissure or parting of the heavens asunder, because they are incorruptible ; but a great, glorious, and miraculous light shone round about Christ, as if the very highest heaven had been open, and the light thereof imparted clearly to the earth :’ but this opinion also is confuted by the word that Mark useth, differing from the other two. For though the phrase, ‘ The heavens were opened,’ would admit of such a metaphorical or comparative exposition,—yet, when Mark saith expressly, that the heavens were ‘ cloven,’ or parted asunder, for so is his word in the original [the Syriac expresseth it by the very same word that the Chaldee paraphrast useth, in Lev. xi, for parting of the hoof], it enforceth us to look for a literal interpretation in it, and not a tropical.

Thirdly ; Aquinas evadeth the real opening of them with this gloss, stranger than both the other, and by another intellectual vision than that that was spoken of before : ‘ For it may also be understood (saith he) of an intellectual vision ; namely, that Christ [baptism being now sanctified] saw heaven open unto men.’ But this exposition, the word of St. Mark, newly mentioned, confuteth much more than it did the other.

Fourthly ; Mark, therefore, tying us to a literal sense, and to understand a real and proper cleaving of the heavens indeed, the doubt now only resteth, what heaven it was, whether the aerial or ethereal,—for so are the heavens properly distinguished, according to the significancy of the Hebrew word ‘ Shamaiim,’ which importeth a duality, or a thing doubled. *Answer* ; It was only the aerial, for that is called heaven, and the firmament, Gen. i. 8. 20 ; as may be confirmed by these reasons :—

First ; Because there needed no farther scissure in the heavens, than the renting of the clouds in the middle region, either for the descending of the Holy Ghost, or of the voice,—or for the satisfying of the eyes and ears of the spectators and hearers, that they came from heaven.

Secondly ; Because the Scripture, in other places, speaking of things which came but out of the clouds, yet useth the very same term to express the clouds by, that is used here,—namely, ‘ heaven :’ as, “ The Lord that gave the law

out of a cloud^c,” is said to have spoken ‘from heaven^d.’ So the like voice to this here, that came out of a cloud^e, yet is said to come from heaven^f. And Elias, that by his prayer shut up the clouds, that there was no rain, is said to have shut up heaven^g. The opening of the heavens, then, was the renting of the clouds, as we see them rent, when the lightning comes forth; and out of that rent came the Holy Ghost in visible shape, and the heavenly voice. And thus did the gospel, or preaching of Christ, begin with the opening of the heavens, which the law had shut; and thus were the heavens shaken, when the Desire of all nations came first to be revealed openly^h. The very same difference of expression that is betwixt St. Mark, and the other evangelists, is betwixt the Hebrew, and the LXX, in Isa. lxiv. 1; for the original readeth כקרה “thou *wouldest* or *hast* rent,” but the Greek, Ἐὰν ἀνοίξῃς, “if thou open” the heavens, &c.

“*The heavens were opened to him.*”

To *him*,—to whom? to Christ, or to John? Why, to the eyes and beholding of them both; for in that Johnⁱ saith, he saw the Holy Ghost coming from, or out of heaven, like a dove, he maketh it past denial, that he saw the opening of the heavens; but the word to *him*, in this place, must be reserved, and referred in a singular peculiarity to Christ; and the opening of the heavens to *him*, importeth a more emphatical propriety, than their opening to his sight. For, the syntax and grammatical construction that Mark useth, maketh it impossible to fix the words to *him*, any other ways than upon Christ: “and straightway (saith he) coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens rent, or cloven,” &c. This, then, being the propriety of the words, that the heaven was opened to our Saviour; and yet, since it was also opened to the sight of John,—it doth necessarily enforce us to understand it otherwise, than only to his view or beholding,—namely, to his prayer: as the phrase is used by him himself, “Knock, and it shall be opened unto you.” For had the evangelist intended only to show, how he saw this apertion in the heaven,—he might have joined John with him in the same sight; but he would give us to understand, by the phrase that he hath used singularly of Christ alone, that the

^c Exod. xix. 16.

^d Exod. xx. 22.

^e Luke, ix. 35.

^f 2 Pet. i. 18.

^g Luke, iv. 25.

^h As Hag. ii. 6, 7.

ⁱ Chap. i. 32.

heavens were not only opened to his sight, but for his sake. And from hence may be confirmed, what was spoken before, concerning his prayer,—namely, that it aimed at such a thing, as Elias prayed, and the heaven was opened, and fire came down upon his sacrifice. Thus heaven, that was shut to the first Adam, because of his sin,—is opened to the second, because of his righteousness,—and to all, that, by faith, are partakers of it.

Mark, i. 10: “*He saw the heavens cloven.*”

This is to be understood, as that before, of Christ only, and after the same sense, or to the same purport. But since it is certain, that John saw this as well as he, as is also observed before, and yet none of the three evangelists, that record the story, have given any undoubted or plain evidence of any such a thing; it may likewise be questioned, whether the rest of the people, which were there present, did see this sight as well as Christ and John. Theophylact is peremptory in the affirmative; “For all of them (saith he) saw the Spirit coming upon Jesus, lest they should think that the voice, ‘This is my beloved Son,’ had been spoken concerning John; but, upon the sight of the Holy Ghost, they might believe that that voice was concerning Christ.” And of this opinion are very many others with him; and no marvel; for who could conceive any other thing? And yet, upon the weighing of these reasons following, we may very well be persuaded to believe the contrary; or that this heavenly spectacle, and divine voice, was conspicuous and audible to none, but only to Christ and John:—

First; Because John, after this, doth himself tell those, that were present at this time, that there had stood one among them, but they knew him not,—that that was he that was to come after him. For the Greek word, ἑστηκεν^k, must, of necessity, be rendered in its preterite signification; for John spake not those words till after Christ was baptized and gone; for he was, at that time, in his temptation in the wilderness.

Secondly; Because Christ himself also telleth the Jews^l, that they had never heard his Father’s voice: and among those to whom he speaketh, were divers that had embraced the doctrine and baptism of John^m, and, it may very well be

^k John, i. 26.

^l John, v. 37.

^m John, v. 35.

supposed, some that were present at his baptism at this very time. The maintainers of the contrary opinion, have spied this scruple and difficulty arising upon that text, and gone about to salve it; but with a very improper and dangerous plaster: holding, that though they heard this voice, yet they heard not the voice of the Father, but of an angel, which spake in his name: which shall be examined by and by.

Thirdly; It is improbable, that, when Christ had such another testimony from heaven, at his transfiguration, he should conceal it from nine of his disciples, and charge the three silence that heard it, and saw what was doneⁿ, and yet should let this voice and vision from heaven be so public, as to be heard and seen of all the people.

Fourthly; John himself telleth, that this revelation was given chiefly, if not only, for his sake^o.

Fifthly; The preaching of the Baptist was the means, that God had ordained, to bring the people to the knowledge of Christ^p,—and this revelation, to bring the Baptist to it.

Sixthly; Had all the people been partakers of this sight and voice, John had needed no more to have pointed Christ out, but the people would have known him, as well as he; nor could the opinion have ever prevailed, as it did, that valued John above him.

Seventhly; When John showed him forth with the finger, with “Behold the Lamb of God,” presently disciples followed him; which they would have done much more, had they thus seen and heard him pointed out from heaven: but it is plain, they did not the one; and, thereupon, it may be boldly concluded, that they did not the other.

Eighthly; To which may be added, that God ordained preaching,—partly of John, partly of Christ himself, and partly of his disciples,—the way to bring the world acquainted that he was Messias. And these divine revelations were for the instruction and confirmation of them his preachers, who were chosen witnesses, for such a purpose, that they, thereupon, might, the more confidently, confirm the people. And hereupon it is observable, that, while the Baptist was at liberty, our Saviour contented himself with his testimony and preaching; but when he was shut up, then instantly chose he others.

ⁿ Matt. xvii. 9.

^o John, i. 33.

^p John, i. 7. 31.

Now, if any doubt of the possibility of this, and question how could John see and hear these things, and the other company, that was present, not do so as well as he,—the answer may be readily given by example of Elisha's servant, 2 Kings vi. 17,—and the two men that went to Emmaus, Luke xxiv: for the mountain was full of horses, and chariots of fire; and Elisha perceived them; but his servant did not, till his eyes were opened in a more special manner. And Christ, it is like, was in the same shape and appearance upon the way, when they knew him not, that he was in the house, when they did; but, till then, their eyes were holden. Yet if any one will suppose, that the people saw the flashing of the opened heaven, and heard the noise of the voice that came from thence, and took the one for lightning, and the other for thunder^a, we will not oppose it; for now was the season of the year fit for lightning and thunder:—but that either they saw the Holy Ghost, or distinguished the words of the voice, any more than Paul's companions did [Acts ix. 7, compared with Acts xxii. 9], the reasons alleged do enforce to deny, till better information.

Matt. iii. 16: “*And he saw the Spirit of God.*”

The syntax and construction of Mark, doth tie and fix these words “he saw” only to our Saviour, as it did those before; and both for the reason mentioned; namely, to show the return and answer of his prayer. But these words of Matthew are not so strict, but that they may equally be applied unto John.

For, first, there may be observed a distinction in the verse, and a kind of difference of speech, betwixt what goeth before, about the opening of the heavens, and this sight of the Holy Ghost. For of that he speaketh thus: “And Jesus, being baptized, went straightway out of the water; and, lo! the heavens were opened unto him.” And then cometh he on with a distinct clause, concerning the other: “And he saw the Spirit of God descending;” leaving it, at the least, in an indifferency, whether to apply it to Christ or John.

But, secondly, it seemeth rather to be understood of John; because he saith himself, that this descending of the Holy Ghost was given to him for a sign, and that he saw it; and if it be not to be so taken here, none of the three evangelists have mentioned it in the story at all.

^a As John, xii. 29.

And, thirdly, the rather may it be taken of John's seeing it, because he saith, He saw him descending and coming, ἐπ' αὐτὸν, 'upon him.' Had it been said, ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν, 'upon himself,' it must needs have been understood of Christ, upon whom the Spirit came; that he saw the Spirit coming upon himself; but, since it is upon *him*, without any reciprocation, it may be the better applied to John, that he saw it. It is true, indeed, that αὐτὸς sometimes signifies reciprocally *himself*, as our lexicons do give examples,—and as it is of force to be taken in St. Mark, in this place; like as ἑαυτοῦ, sometimes, doth not signify reciprocally, as in the LXX, in Judg. vii. 24. But why should we take the word out of its commonest and properest sense, unless there were necessity to do it?—which, in Matthew, there is not, though in Mark there be.

Fourthly, and lastly; These words, 'he saw,' being understood of John, it maketh that, the three evangelists being laid together, the relation ariseth out of them the more full, and the story more plain. For Luke telling that the heavens were opened, and the Holy Ghost descended,—Mark addeth, that Jesus saw this,—and Matthew, that John.

“ *The Spirit of God.* ”

רוח אלהים “The Spirit of God” moved upon the face of the waters in the beginning of the old world; and so doth it here, of the new. It is needless to instance, how oft, in Scripture, the Holy Ghost is called, ‘the Spirit of God;’ as, Gen. xli. 38; Exod. xxxi. 3; Num. xxiv. 2; and very many other places: but it is most necessary to observe, that, wheresoever he is so called, it is, in the Hebrew, ‘the Spirit of Elohim,’ in the plural number, and sheweth his proceeding from more persons than one.—Contrary to the opinion of the Greek church, that holdeth, that the Holy Ghost proceedeth, not from the Father and the Son, but from the Father only.

Luke, iii. 22: “ *The Holy Ghost.* ”

As he is called “the Spirit,” not so much in regard of his own nature, as in regard of his manner of proceeding,—so also is he called “Holy,” not so much in respect of his person, for the Father and Son are spirits, and are holy, as

^r Gen. i. 2.

well as he,—but in regard of his work and office, which is to sanctify the church of God. And, in this respect, he is called, by the Hebrews, not רוח קדוש, ‘the Holy Spirit’ only, but רוח הקדש ‘the Spirit of Holiness;’ for this phrase, ‘the Holy Ghost,’ is taken from the common speech of the Jews. And so he is called by Paul^s, Πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης: and so doth the Syrian call him ‘Ruhha dekudsha,’ in this place.

§ “*The Holy Ghost descended.*”

This descending of the Holy Ghost was, first, partly, for the sake of John; for this token had been given him, when he first began to preach and baptize, whereby to know Christ when he should come^t.

Secondly, Partly for Christ, that he might thus receive his consecration and institution for the office that he was now to enter upon,—the preaching of the gospel. This was, as his anointing, to instal him into his function, as Aaron and his sons were with material oil, to enter them into theirs; as Isa. lxi. 1, “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me; therefore hath he anointed me; he hath sent me to preach the gospel.” And,

Thirdly, Partly for the business and matter that was now to go in hand; namely, Christ’s beginning to preach accordingly. For,

First, The gospel is the spiritual kingdom and sceptre of Christ, in and by which he was to rule all nations for ever; and, therefore, it was agreeable that the spiritualness of that should be sealed and confirmed by the Holy Spirit’s showing himself even in the beginning of it. The carnal rites of Moses were now to vanish, and his corporal and ceremonial observances to be changed into a spiritual worship: and neither at Jerusalem, nor at mount Gerizim, nor elsewhere, must there be any more adoration, with fleshly and earthly ceremoniousness; but he that will worship God, must worship him in spirit^u. Therefore, it is no wonder, if the Holy Ghost doth now reveal himself, now when his sway of spirituality and dominion, by sanctification, is to begin.

Secondly; The Holy Ghost was departed from Israel, after the death of the last prophets, as was observed before, and now he is to be restored again; therefore, himself cometh

^s Rom. i. 4.

^t John, i. 33.

^u As John, iv. 21.

visibly and apparently at this his restoring, and lighteth upon him, to whom it belonged to give and distribute the gifts of the Spirit, to whom he pleased. For, as John had told, that Christ should baptize with the Holy Ghost,—so is that power and privilege now sealed unto him in the sight of John, when the Holy Ghost cometh down upon him and there abideth.

§ “*Descended in a bodily shape.*”

God is said to descend; not that he moveth from place to place, or cometh where he was not before; for he is incircumscribable, and every where, and filleth all places:—but in that he sheweth this his presence upon earth, in such or such a place, by some external sign and visible appearance. And so he is said, to ‘*come down* to see, whether the wickedness of Sodom were according to the cry, that was come up unto him,’ because he revealed himself to Abraham, Lot, and the Sodomites, in the visible and conspicuous representation of men. So is he said to have *come down* upon Mount Sinai, because of the outward revealing and expression of his presence there. And so the Chaldee paraphrast understandeth the Trinity’s descending, Gen. xi. 5, for a conspicuous appearance of it; for he translateth, “The Lord revealed himself to take vengeance,” &c. And so is the Holy Ghost said to descend in this story, and in that in Acts ii; not but that he was present in the same places before, by his power and Godhead, but that he revealed and expressed his presence by so sensible an evidence, and by, and in, so revealed a work.

§ “*In a bodily shape.*”

First; It was convenient that the Holy Ghost should reveal himself at this time: first, for the sake of John, who was to have a sensible sign, whereby to inform him, which was the Messiah; as John i.

Secondly; In regard of the Holy Ghost himself, whose work in the church was now, in a more special and frequent manner, to be showed under the gospel,—namely, that he might be expressed and revealed to be a personal substance, and not an operation of the Godhead only, or qualitative virtue. For qualities, operations, and acts, cannot assume bodily shapes, nor aught but what is in itself substantial.

Thirdly ; That a full and clear, yea, even a sensible, demonstration of the Trinity, might be made at this beginning of the gospel. For it may be observed in Scripture, that the Holy Ghost hath a special regard to express this mystery upon singular occasions, that we might learn to acknowledge the three persons in one Godhead,—as he also doth the two natures of Christ, that we might acknowledge them in one person. So the very first thing that is taught in all the Bible, is this very mystery : for when Moses beginneth the story of the creation, he beginneth also to teach, that the three persons in the Trinity were co-workers in it. ‘God created ;’ there is the Father :—‘God said ;’ there is the Word, or the Son :—and ‘the Spirit of God moved ;’ there is the Holy Ghost. And the very same mystery is intimated by the prophet, treating upon the very same subject, Isa. xlii. 5 ; “Thus saith God the Lord, *he* that created the heavens, and *they* that stretched them out :” that we might learn, that “of him, through him, and to him,” the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, “are all things^v.” So Moses, also, when he is to teach concerning the creation of man, first teacheth that it was the Trinity that created him ; “And God said, Let us make man after our image^w.” He saith, “Let us,” to show the trinity of persons :—and he saith, “in our image,” not “in our *images*,” to show the unity of essence ; that every man, even from the reading of the story of his creation, might learn to remember his Creators in the days of his youth ; as Solomon^x, with the word בוראִי, answereth the same mystery. So, likewise, at the confusion of tongues, the Trinity is expressed^y ; “Let *us* go down, and confound their language :” as it is, also, at the gift of tongues ; “I will send the Comforter from the Father^z.” Such a one, also, was the blessing pronounced by the priest upon the people, when he dismissed them from the daily service of the temple, in the name of the Trinity^a ; the name ‘Jehovah,’ or ‘the Lord,’ is three times repeated, for denotation of the three persons, as Paul explaineth it, 2 Cor. xiii. 14. When Moses, also, beginneth to rehearse the law to Israel, and to explain it, the first thing he teacheth them is, the Trinity in Unity, and Unity in Trinity ; “Hear, O Israel,

^v Rom. xi. 36.^w Gen. i. 26.^x Eccles. xii. 1.^y Gen. xi. 7.^z John, xv. 26. Acts, i. 4.^a Num. vi. 24—26.

the Lord, our God, the Lord, is one^b." Three words answering the three persons, and the middle word *our God*, deciphering fitly the second, who assumed our nature; as is well observed by Galatinus. To these may be added, the entrance of Moses's revelation, with the name of the Lord three times rehearsed^c; the vision of Isaiah with three holies^d; the beginning of Psal. l, and of Psal. cxxxvi; and many of the like nature, which the heedful reader will observe himself. How fitting, then, was it, that, at the beginning of the new world, and the new law, and the baptism of Christ, the three persons should be revealed, especially since he ordained baptism to be administered in their names; "Baptize them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost^e."

§ "*Like a dove.*"

It is thought by Austin, and after him by Aquinas, that this was a very living dove,—not of the flock, indeed, of common doves, but immediately created by God for this purpose, but created as true a living dove, as any of them. And the reason they give for this their opinion, is this: "Because it is not to be said, that Christ alone had a true body, and that the Holy Ghost appeared deceivably to the eyes of men, but that both those are to be said to be true bodies: for, as it was not fit, that the Son of God should deceive men, so was it not fit, that the Holy Ghost should deceive them neither. But it was no difficulty to the Creator of all things, to make a true body of a dove, without the help of other doves,—as it was not hard for him to frame a true body in the womb of the Virgin, without the seed of man." So they, too punctual where there is no necessity, nor indeed any great probability. For,

First, What needed there a real living dove, when an apparent only would serve the turn? for the descending of the dove was, that there might be a visible demonstration of the Holy Ghost's resting upon Christ, and anointing him for his ministration; so that the visibility of the Spirit was as much as was required, and there needed no reality of a living body.

Secondly, The text saith expressly, in all the evangelists,

^b Deut. vi. 4.

^c Exod. xxxiv. 6.

^d Isa. vi. 3.

^e Matt. xxviii. 19.

that it was ὡσεὶ περιστέρα, 'like,' or 'as it were, a dove;' which plainly sheweth the similitude to such a thing; and not the being of the very thing itself.

Thirdly, In apparitions of the like nature, when the farthest end of the body appearing, was but for visibility,—the bodies that were seen, were not of the very existency and nature of those that they represented, but of another. As the angels that appeared in human shapes, had not very living human bodies, but only bodies assumed and framed to such a representation: and so the fire in the bush, on Sinai, and with the cloven tongues, was not very real fire, but only a visible resemblance of it: and the like must be held of this dove, or else it will be such an apparition as never was before, nor since.

Fourthly, The parallel betwixt the appearing of our Saviour, in human flesh, and the appearing of the Holy Ghost, in a living dove, is not only very improper, but also somewhat dangerous. For if they appeared alike, then may the Holy Ghost be said to be a very dove, for Christ was a very man; and that were improper: and, in its kind, to be incarnate, for Christ was incarnate; and that is dangerous. And,

Fifthly, As for fallacy, or deceiving, there could be none, no more than there had been in all other apparitions since the world began; since, in such things, the verity and reality of the body that appeared, was not looked after, but only the conspicuity, and the spirit that lay hid under that body.

Now, reasons why the Holy Ghost appeared in the shape of a dove, rather than of any other creature, are conceived, some to have concerned Christ, some to have concerned the Holy Ghost himself, and some to have concerned man. As,

First, To show Christ's innocency, purity, simplicity, charity, and love; for all these qualities are observable in a dove.

Secondly, To show the like graces of the Holy Ghost; and Aquinas and Ludolphus do parallel the seven graces of the Spirit [Isa. xi. 2, 3], to seven properties of a dove; as, if any be so curious as to see them, he may, in Ludolph. in locum, and Aquin. part. 3. quæst. 39. art. 6.

Thirdly, To show what innocency and harmlessness should be in those, that are baptized.

Fourthly, To answer the figure in Noah's flood; for, as

a dove did, at that time, bring tidings of the abating of the waters,—so doth it now, of the abating of the wrath of God, upon the preaching of the gospel. These are the common and most current reasons, that are given by expositors; to which may be added:—

Fifthly, That since Christ was to have visible testimony from heaven, it was fittest it should be by the likeness of a fowl of heaven. For it was not fitting, that fire should have come thence upon him; for he was to baptize, and not to be baptized, with fire: and for a cloud to come from thence upon him, was reserved till another time,—namely, at his transfiguration: and what, then, can be imagined to descend upon him, but a bird? and what bird so fit as a dove, which was the only fowl that was clean, and allowed for sacrifice^f?

Matt. iii. 16: “*And lighting upon him.*”

In the strictness of the Greek, it is “coming upon him,” which is to the very same signification: especially the addition of the Baptist^g himself being laid unto it,—viz. “that it abode upon him.” Some conceive, and that not improperly, that the dove sat upon his head: which if it did, it was like the inscription in the golden plate, that was on the forehead of the high-priest, and declared him to be, “The Holy One of the Lord^h.” How long the dove sat upon him, is not to be questioned, because not to be answered: it is not unlike, that it did so, all the while he was in the sight of John at this time; especially seeing that the text saith, that “straightway this Spirit drove him into the wilderness.”

Ver. 17: “*And lo! a voice from heaven.*”

The testimony of two witnesses, is a confirmation past denial; and greater witnesses than these two could not be produced,—the Father, and the Holy Ghost,—because a testimony could not be given to a greater than to Christ. Nor could these two witnesses have properly gone single, one without the other: the descending of the dove, to point out to whom the voice was intended,—and the descending of the voice, explaining what was meant by the descending of the dove.

^f Lev. i. 14.

^g John, i. 32.

^h קדש ליהוה, Exod. xxviii. 36.

§ "A voice."

Both the Talmudic and the latter Rabbins make frequent mention of 'Bath Kol,' 'Filia vocis,' or 'an echoing voice,'—which served, under the second temple, for their utmost refuge of revelation. For when Urim and Thummim, the oracle, was ceased, and prophecy was decayed and gone, they had [as they say] certain strange and extraordinary voices, upon extraordinary occasion, which were their warnings, and advertisements, in some special matters. Infinite instances of this might be adduced, if they might be believed; one allegation in the Talmud shall serve for all, concerning Jonathan the Chaldee paraphrastⁱ: "When Jonathan, the son of Uzziel (say they), had composed the Targum of the prophets, there came Bath Kol, or a Divine Voice, and said, Who hath revealed my secrets to the sons of men? And when he went about to explain the Cetubhim, or the books of holy writ, there came a Bath Kol, or a Divine Voice, again, and said, It is enough. What is the reason? Because in them is revealed the end of the Messias."

Now, here it may be doubly questioned: First, Why they called it 'Bath Kol,' 'The daughter of a voice,' and not a voice itself? And, secondly, Whether this voice, that we have in hand, were such a voice as that or no? To the first, if the strictness of the Hebrew word 'Bath,' be to be stood upon, which it always is not,—it may be answered, that it is called, 'the daughter of a voice,' in relation to the oracle of Urim and Thummim: for, whereas that was a voice given from off the mercy-seat, within the vail,—and this, upon the decay of that oracle, came, as it were, in its place,—it might, not unfitly, nor improperly, be called, 'a daughter,' or successor, of that voice. But to the second, and which is more material and pertinent to the subject in hand, it may be answered, that this voice was not of the nature of their Bath Kol, upon these two reasons:—

First, Because this voice came descendingly from heaven; but their Bath Kol cannot be proved to have descended, or, at least, to have constantly come, from heaven. For the "Migremus hinc," which gave warning of the destruction of the city, came not from above, but from the temple^j. And this can hardly be denied to have been one of their Bath

ⁱ In Megillah.^j As Isa. lxvj. 6.

Kol voices: and if we will believe the Jewish authors, in every place, where they give examples of this their Bath Kol,—it will appear, rather to be such a voice as came to Samuel; which was so far from a perpendicular descending voice, that he could not distinguish, whether it were the call of Eli.

Secondly, Because, whereas the Jews repute their Bath Kol, both the last and the lowest kind of divine revelation among them: this kind of a voice from heaven, was both most ancient, as Gen. xxi. 17, and xxii. 11; and also most honourable, Exod. xx. 22; Deut. iv. 33. 36.

§ “*From heaven.*”

The opinion that these words were spoken by an angel, deputed by God for that purpose, which some do hold, is not only improper, but also dangerous: improper, because it crosseth a plain and facile text; and dangerous, because it bringeth a created angel into a kind of equality and co-partnership with the sacred Trinity. For,

First, Why should there be any surmise of such an angel, uttering these words, unless it might be thought, that God could not utter them himself?

Secondly, As Paul saith, “To which of the angels said God at any time, Thou art my son,”—so may it be said much more, “which of the angels ever durst, or might, call Christ his son?”

Thirdly, Peter^k, speaking of the parallel, or like voice to this, which was uttered at our Saviour’s transfiguration, saith, it came “from the excellent glory;” which, doubtless, sheweth more than from an angel.

Matt. iii. 17: “*This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.*”

In Mark and Luke it is, “Thou art my beloved Son,” &c. whereas Matthew expresseth it, “This is:”—which though it show some difference, yet is it not material: nor doth the difference breed so much difficulty, as it doth satisfaction to the reader, and fulness to the story. For the two evangelists, first named, relate it as spoken to Christ, for the sealing of his person, and in answer to his prayer; but the other expresseth it only as spoken of Christ, and not to him, but pointing him out to the notice of John.

^k 2 Pet. i. 17.

Now, this whole speech is taken from 2 Sam. vii. 14; Psal. lxxxix. 26, 27; and Isa. xlii. 1: and when it is uttered again from heaven, at our Saviour's transfiguration, this addition, "Hear him," is put to it, Matt. xvii. 5; Luke ix. 35; sealing him then for the great Prophet of his church, whom all must hear¹, as it sealeth him now for the high-priest of his church, being now to enter into his ministry.

Luke, iii. 23: "*And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age.*"

Agreeable to this age of Christ, when he began his ministry, was the age of the priests, when they entered their office^m; the age of Joseph, when he came to promotionⁿ; and the age of David, when he began to reign^o. Now, how this is to be understood, is some controversy: some there are that take it thus, That Jesus was now fully and perfectly thirty:—others, thus, That he now began, or drew on, to be full thirty; and so, preaching three years and six months, that he died at thirty-three years old and a half.

But this interpretation, the phrase used by the evangelist, and the common and ordinary manner of the Scripture's reckoning of the ages of men, and of other things, doth sufficiently contradict. For,

First, In that Luke saith, ἀρχόμενος ὡν ὥσεί, he was baptized, "beginning to be, as it were, thirty:" the word 'beginning to be,' denieth his being thirty complete; and the word 'as it were,' denieth his drawing upon thirty complete likewise: for, if he were full thirty, then he began not to be so; and, if he were drawing on to full thirty, then was he not drawing to, as it were, thirty, but to thirty indeed. By the phrase, therefore, is to be understood, that he was now nine-and-twenty years of age complete, and just now entering upon his thirtieth: and this the evangelist hinteth so clearly, that it needeth not much confirmation: for, that he was in his thirty current and not completed, is plain by the word ὥσεί, 'as it were' thirty,—that is, thirty years old, after a certain reckoning: and that he was but now entering upon this his thirty current, is as plain by the word ἀρχόμενος, 'he began' but to be so.

To which also, secondly, may be added the common and current use of Scripture, in reckoning of ages, either of men

¹ Dent. xviii. 15.

^m Num. iv. 3.

ⁿ Gen. xli. 46.

^o 2 Sam. v. 4.

or beasts,—to account the year which they are now passing, for a year of their age, be it never so newly or lately begun: examples of this it is needless to give, the thing is so usual and obvious to every eye.

So that now to take up the times of the world, and of our Saviour, according to this computation, they result to this:—

First, That since he was born in the year of the world 3928, *stylo veteri*, but newly begun, he was baptized in the year of the world 3957, but newly begun, by the same style likewise.

Secondly, That since he was born in Tisri, he was also baptized in Tisri.

Thirdly, That since his last residence in Beth-lehem, to his first appearing publicly in the work of the gospel, were full seven-and-twenty years: all which time he had lived either in Nazareth, the town of his mother,—or in Capernaum, the town of his supposed father: and so his birth in Beth-lehem, is utterly grown out of the thoughts and observation of the people.

Fourthly, That he hath now three years and a half to labour in the gospel, from his baptism to his crucifying. Rabbi Janna said, “Three years and a half the glory of God stood upon mount Olivet, and preached, saying, Seek the Lord while he may be found, call upon him while he is near^p.”

Fifthly, That he lived but two-and-thirty years and a half: and that his thirtieth year was the first year of his preaching, and not the last year of his private life, compare the date of David’s reign in Jerusalem, 1 Chron. xxix. 27; “The time that David reigned over Israel, was forty years: seven years reigned he in Hebron, and thirty-three years reigned he in Jerusalem:” exactly, “seven years and six months reigned he in Hebron,” 2 Sam. v. 5; and then thirty-and-two years and six months reigned he in Jerusalem.

Sixthly, That if Jerusalem were destroyed exactly forty years after our Saviour’s death, as it is apparent it was, both in Christian and heathen stories,—then that destruction of it befel just in the four thousandth year of the world; and so, as the temple of Solomon had been finished, *anno mundi*,

^p Midr. Tillim.

exactly 3000,—so, in anno mundi, exactly 4000, both the city and the temple that then were, were destroyed, never to be repaired or rebuilt again. And, from that time most properly began ‘the kingdom of heaven,’ and the new Jerusalem, when that earthly kingdom, and that old city, were utterly ruined.

§ “ *Being [as was supposed] the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli.*”

At every descent in this genealogy, the word *Jesus* is to be understood ; otherwise, the first and last descents are improper, and different in style from all the rest. For Joseph was not the son of Heli, but only his son-in-law ; and Adam was no more the son of God, than any of the other holy men, that were named before. The supply, therefore, is thus to be made, to make all proper,—Jesus being, as was supposed, the son of Joseph, Jesus the son of Heli, Jesus the son of Matthat, &c: Jesus the son of Seth, Jesus the son of Adam, Jesus the son of God.

And the like style of genealogy, Moses^a useth:—“Aholibamah the daughter of Anah, the daughter of Zibeon ;” where Anah is not called the daughter of Zibeon, for he was a man, and not a woman: no more was Joseph the son of Heli ; for he was only his son-in-law : but the word ‘Aholibamah,’ is to be supplied thus,—“Aholibamah the daughter of Anah, Aholibamah the daughter of Zibeon.”

Heli, or Eli, [for the name seemeth to be the same with his in 1 Sam. i. 3, &c.] was not the natural father of Joseph ; for Matthew told us plainly before, that it was Jacob that begot Joseph ; but Heli was the father of Mary, and father-in-law of Joseph only. Now, because it is not used in Scripture to mention any woman in a pedigree, or to run the line from the mother, but from the father, to the son,—therefore, Mary is not here named at all, but intimated or included, when the line begins from her father, and calleth her husband his son, which he was only because of her.

So that Luke, intending to show Christ the seed of the woman, must, of necessity, reckon by Mary, the daughter of Heli,—as Matthew, intending to show him the heir of the crown of David, doth reckon by Joseph, the heir male apparent. In comparing and laying together these men, that Mat-

^a Gen. xxxvi. 2.

thew and Luke have named, in the ancestry of Joseph and Mary, betwixt the returning out of the captivity, and the times of our Saviour,—we find, that every one man in the stock of Joseph, did almost outlive two of those in the line of Mary; the one line affording twenty descents betwixt those two periods,—and the other, but one above half so many: which easily and readily confuteth that opinion, that some have strangely held, that the persons in the two genealogies have been the same men, only under different names: and it helpeth somewhat to settle the times between those two periods, against the different miscountings of several men; some stretching them longer, than the eleven persons, named in Matthew, could stretch to live,—and some, cutting them shorter, than the twenty, named in Luke, could be comprehended in.

Ver. 27: “ *Which was the son of Salathiel, which was the son of Neri.*”

Neri was the natural father of Salathiel: he seemeth to have been so named, from the candle which the Lord reserved for David and his house^r.

Ver. 31: “ *Which was the son of Nathan.*”

It is like, that he was named after Nathan the prophet, who brought David word of the promise^t, and of the continuance of his house, which failed in the race of Solomon: but continued in the race of this Nathan, till the King came, that was to sit on David’s throne for ever. Here again the number of persons in the genealogy of Mary, betwixt David and the captivity, exceed the number in the genealogy of Joseph, in Matt. i.

Ver. 36: “ *Which was the son of Cainan, which was the son of Arphaxad.*”

In Moses^u it is said, “ Arphaxad begat Shelah, and Shelah begat Eber.” And so is it briefly reckoned, 1 Chron. i. 24, “ Shem, Arphaxad, Shelah,” without any mention of Cainan at all; nor is there any memorial of such a son of Arphaxad throughout all the Old Testament; nor, indeed, was there ever any such a man in the world at all. Here, therefore, is

^r 2 Chron. xxi. 27.

^t 2 Sam. vii.

^u 2 Sam. v. 14. 1 Chron. iii. 5.

^v Gen. x. 24, xi. 12.

an extraordinary scruple, and a question of no small difficulty meeteth us ; Where Luke found the name of this man, which is not to be found elsewhere in all the Bible ? And, Whether it be not an error in the text, and were not a miscarriage in the evangelist,—to reckon a man for an ancestor of Christ, that the world never saw, or that never was upon the earth ?

Answer. It is easy, indeed, to resolve, where Luke found this name of Cainan, and from whence he took it,—namely, from the Greek Bible, or the Septuagint, which hath inserted it in those places of Moses that are alleged : but when this is resolved, the greater scruple is yet behind,—of his warrantableness so to do, and of the purity of the text, where it is so done.

The Seventy translators, indeed, read Gen. x. 24 thus, “ Arphaxad begat Cainan, and Cainan begat Salah, and Salah begat Eber.” And, in chap. xi, they say, “ Arphaxad lived one hundred and thirty-five years, and begat Cainan ; and Cainan lived one hundred and thirty years, and begat Salah ; and Cainan lived after he begat Salah, three hundred and thirty years.” And from hence hath St. Luke, without controversy, taken in Cainan into this genealogy,—a man that never was in the world ; but the warrantableness of this insertion will require divers considerations to find it out. As let the reader be pleased seriously to ruminate upon these:—

First, That the Seventy translators did that work unwillingly, and for fear : for the Scripture was the treasure of the Jews, which made them more glorious than any nation under heaven. Therefore, to communicate this their riches to the heathen, whom they abominated and detested, was as much against their heart as what was most. So that had not the fear of the power of Ptolemy brought them to the work of the translation, more than their own good will, there had been no such thing done. Ptolemy Lagus, the father of Ptolemy Philadelphus, for whom they translated, had carried away a hundred thousand Jews captive into Egypt, as saith Aristeas ; so that the fear and dread of that house lay upon them, that they durst deny it nothing ; which otherwise they would most vehemently have done such a thing as this, to have communicated their Scriptures to the heathen in a vulgar tongue.

Secondly, The translation, then, being undertaken for fear, and with so ill a will [that, as Aristeas, who was present at the work, saith, the translators were very unwilling to go for Egypt,—though he interpret it, because loath to go from Eleazar the high-priest], and that the Jews kept a mournful fast every year, sorrowing for that work of the translation;—it cannot be expected, that the translation will be done with any more fidelity, than barely what will keep the translators out of danger.

Thirdly, Therefore they strive, as much as they can, to conceal the truth and treasure of the Scripture from the heathen, and, as much as they dare, to delude them. Their chief means for this, is, to use an unpricked Bible, in which the words written without vowels, might be bended divers ways, and into divers senses, and different from the meaning of the original; and yet, if the translation were questioned, they might prick or vowel the word, so as to agree to their translation. How they have dealt in this kind, there is none that ever laid the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint together, but hath observed.

Fourthly, Their differences from the original, which were innumerable, were, partly, of ignorance,—they themselves not being able to read the text always true in a copy unvoweled. But this ignorance was also voluntary in them; they not caring to mistake, so that they might do it with their own security.

Their general care was, that since, of necessity, they must translate the Bible, as little of it might be imparted and revealed by the translation, as was possible.

Their particular and special heed was, also, that those places of the text, which, translated literally or according to the true meaning, might prove dangerous any ways to the nation of the Jews, or bring them into distaste with the potent king for whom they translated,—should be so tempered and qualified, that no hazard might arise, nor any such matter might be seen.

Fifthly, It was a common speech among the Jews, and rang ordinarily in their schools and pulpits, “That the seventy souls of Jacob’s family, that went down into Egypt, were equivalent, or answerable in worth, to all the seventy nations of the world.”

This was a dangerous doctrine for the Jews, if it should

come to be known, as it could not choose but be: especially, when their puissant enemies should find the numbers agreeable, of seventy souls, Gen. xlv, —and seventy nations, Gen. x. —To prevent any such danger, the translators thought it a sure way, to spoil the just number in both places; and so they did reckon seventy-five souls, and seventy-two nations: both which accounts are followed by St. Luke, Acts vii, and in this place.

Sixthly, The several persons, reckoned Gen. x, every one of which was the father and original of a several nation, be just seventy. The translators, to spoil the sum, which might prove perilous,—have added two more, and both of the same name, Cainan,—the one, the immediate son of Shem,—the other, his grandchild, or the son of Arphaxad. For, ver. 22 of that chapter, they read thus; “The sons of Shem were Elam, and Asshur, and Arphaxad, and Lud, and Aram, and Cainan;” and ver. 24, thus; “Arphaxad begat Cainan, and Cainan begat Salah.”

In which additions, these two things are very observable:—

First, The place, where they have thrust in these two men:—namely, so close to Shem, as could not possibly be closer, unless they would have had him to have had two sons of the same name, Cainan.

Secondly, The name itself, that they have thus chosen twice over,—namely, Cainan, which signifieth ‘mourning’ or ‘lamenting.’ So Enos called his son [Gen. v. 9], because of the lamentable corruption of religion in those times.—And it is without doubt, the translators, in the iterated choice of this word, or heavy and doleful name, intended to show some inward sorrow: the cause of which may be best imagined, by laying the name and the place of it together.

The blessing of Noah upon Japheth, “God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem^x,” the Jews themselves, of old, understood, to aim at the Greek tongue; viz. that God should use that as a means for the admission of the heathen to the secrets and mysteries of the Jews’ religion. This was their vexation at all times, to hear, or to think, of the Gentiles being called, as appears by Jonah^y,—by the Nazarites^z,—and by them of Jerusalem^a: for Moses

^x Gen. ix. 27. ^y Chap. iv. 1. ^z Luke, iv. 28. ^a Acts, xxii. 21, 22.

had plainly told them^b, that their calling in should be the others' casting off.

Therefore, it could not but be a most vehement sorrow and main vexation to these translators, that they, perforce, and so sore against their wills, must be made the instruments, by translating the Bible into Greek, to let Japheth, or the heathen, into the tents of Shem.

This sorrow, as their nation expressed by a mournful fast, so did they themselves, among other things, by a 'lamenting' and 'sorrowing' name, Cainan twice over, put in so close to Shem, as if they called on him to mourn with them, because his tents were now unlocking for the entrance of the Gentiles.

Seventhly, God, using the Septuagint, as the key for admission of the heathen, and as a harbinger to the New Testament,—left it not there, but therein used it, also, in allegations from the Old, yet oftentimes differing from the letter of the same, but never without special reason.

Eighthly, St. Luke, as he followed the doctor of the Gentiles, St. Paul, so he wrote his Gospel for the Gentiles: therefore, whereas Matthew, writing his for the Jews, deriveth the genealogy but from Abraham, the first father of the Jews,—this evangelist, writing for the Gentiles, fetcheth the line from Adam, the common father of all, both Jews and Gentiles.

This is the aim and scope of this genealogy, and the reason why it is set at Christ's baptism:—

First, To show that there was no distinction of persons in the promise given to Adam; for all nations were then equally in his loins: for this, the holy line runs down to him.

Secondly, That, therefore, all nations have equal interest in the Messias; and that, in the preaching of the gospel, which Christ began from his baptism, there should be no difference of people made, as there was before. This being the intent of the pedigree's placing here, as the very placing of it doth inevitably evince, it is not only warrantable, but also admirably divine, that Luke taketh in Cainan from the seventy.

For, first, writing for heathens, he must follow the heathens' Bible in his quotations.

^b Deut. xxxii. 21.

Secondly, In genealogies, he was to be a copier, not a corrector.

Thirdly, and chiefly, In following this insertion of the Seventy, he embraceth not their error, but divinely draweth us to look at their intent.

When Jude mentioneth Michael's striving with Satan about the body of Moses, he approveth not the story as true, which he knew to be but a Talmudic parable; but, from the Jews' own authors, he useth this as an argument against them, and for their instruction.

So, though Luke, from the Seventy, the Bible of the heathen, have alleged Cainan the son of Arphaxad, he allegeth it not as the truth more than the Hebrew; but, from the Septuagint's own authority, or from the matter which they inserted in distaste of the calling of the heathen, he maketh comfortable use and instruction to the heathen concerning their calling.

First, They put in two men, Gen. x, that they might dissemble their arrogating of singularity above all nations, and to make Ptolemy believe, that there was no such distinction of people held by them: but they thought otherwise.

Luke reserves the one of these in his pedigree (for the other could not come in it), to teach the Gentiles really, what they did in dissimulation,—that there was no such distinction of nations in the sight of God, even the Seventy themselves being witnesses.

Secondly, They used a mournful name for the men whom they inserted, in detestation of the coming in of the Gentiles: Luke reserves this, also, for the comfort of the Gentiles, which were now to be called in; to teach them, from the Jews' own confession, that the divulging of the gospel in vulgar languages, should bring Japheth into the tents of Shem: which thing was now ready to begin, when Christ, at his baptism, is anointed to preach the gospel, and to send it abroad to be preached both to Jew and Gentile. And what the Seventy, in their Cainan, sorrowed to see afar off, Luke, in his Cainan, calls to behold now with comfort near at hand.

Thus are the censers of Korah and his company, though ordained for an evil end by them, yet reserved in the sanctuary for a good by the command of God.

Ver. 38 : “ *Which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God.*”

Thus hath the evangelist showed Christ to be the seed of the woman, promised to Adam, and descended from him : and that, he that was proclaimed the ‘seed of the woman,’ to Adam, in the garden, was now pointed out and proclaimed ‘the Son of God,’ from heaven, to John, at Jordan. And thus doth the evangelist conclude this genealogy with a clear expression of Christ’s two natures,—his humanity, for he was the ‘son of Adam;’ his divinity, for he was the ‘Son of God.’ And this lesson of these two natures being knit and united in the person of our Saviour, the evangelists all of them teach very frequently, as they go along, as a thing of chief and choice observation ; which we shall take up and observe, as we proceed.

Ver. 38: "Which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God."

Thus hath the evangelist showed Christ to be the seed of the woman, promised to Adam, and descended from him: and that, he that was proclaimed the seed of the woman, to Adam, in the garden, was now pointed out and proclaimed the Son of God, from heaven, to John, at Jordan. And thus doth the evangelist conclude this genealogy with a clear expression of Christ's two natures,—his humanity, for he was the son of Adam; his divinity, for he was the Son of God. And this lesson of these two natures being knit and united in the person of our Saviour, the evangelists all of them teach very frequently, as they go along, as a thing of chief and choice observation; which we shall take up and observe, as we proceed.

And thus hath the evangelist showed Christ to be the seed of the woman, promised to Adam, and descended from him: and that, he that was proclaimed the seed of the woman, to Adam, in the garden, was now pointed out and proclaimed the Son of God, from heaven, to John, at Jordan. And thus doth the evangelist conclude this genealogy with a clear expression of Christ's two natures,—his humanity, for he was the son of Adam; his divinity, for he was the Son of God. And this lesson of these two natures being knit and united in the person of our Saviour, the evangelists all of them teach very frequently, as they go along, as a thing of chief and choice observation; which we shall take up and observe, as we proceed.

And thus hath the evangelist showed Christ to be the seed of the woman, promised to Adam, and descended from him: and that, he that was proclaimed the seed of the woman, to Adam, in the garden, was now pointed out and proclaimed the Son of God, from heaven, to John, at Jordan. And thus doth the evangelist conclude this genealogy with a clear expression of Christ's two natures,—his humanity, for he was the son of Adam; his divinity, for he was the Son of God. And this lesson of these two natures being knit and united in the person of our Saviour, the evangelists all of them teach very frequently, as they go along, as a thing of chief and choice observation; which we shall take up and observe, as we proceed.

And thus hath the evangelist showed Christ to be the seed of the woman, promised to Adam, and descended from him: and that, he that was proclaimed the seed of the woman, to Adam, in the garden, was now pointed out and proclaimed the Son of God, from heaven, to John, at Jordan. And thus doth the evangelist conclude this genealogy with a clear expression of Christ's two natures,—his humanity, for he was the son of Adam; his divinity, for he was the Son of God. And this lesson of these two natures being knit and united in the person of our Saviour, the evangelists all of them teach very frequently, as they go along, as a thing of chief and choice observation; which we shall take up and observe, as we proceed.

And thus hath the evangelist showed Christ to be the seed of the woman, promised to Adam, and descended from him: and that, he that was proclaimed the seed of the woman, to Adam, in the garden, was now pointed out and proclaimed the Son of God, from heaven, to John, at Jordan. And thus doth the evangelist conclude this genealogy with a clear expression of Christ's two natures,—his humanity, for he was the son of Adam; his divinity, for he was the Son of God. And this lesson of these two natures being knit and united in the person of our Saviour, the evangelists all of them teach very frequently, as they go along, as a thing of chief and choice observation; which we shall take up and observe, as we proceed.

And thus hath the evangelist showed Christ to be the seed of the woman, promised to Adam, and descended from him: and that, he that was proclaimed the seed of the woman, to Adam, in the garden, was now pointed out and proclaimed the Son of God, from heaven, to John, at Jordan. And thus doth the evangelist conclude this genealogy with a clear expression of Christ's two natures,—his humanity, for he was the son of Adam; his divinity, for he was the Son of God. And this lesson of these two natures being knit and united in the person of our Saviour, the evangelists all of them teach very frequently, as they go along, as a thing of chief and choice observation; which we shall take up and observe, as we proceed.

THE
HARMONY
OF
THE FOUR EVANGELISTS,
AMONG THEMSELVES, AND WITH THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The Second Part.

FROM THE
BAPTISM OF OUR SAVIOUR TO THE FIRST PASSOVER AFTER:
WITH
AN EXPLANATION
OF THE
CHIEFEST DIFFICULTIES BOTH IN LANGUAGE AND SENSE.

THE
HARMONY
OF
THE FOUR EVANGELISTS,
AMONG THEMSELVES, AND WITH THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE SECOND PART.

FROM THE
BAPTISM OF OUR SAVIOUR TO THE FIRST PASSOVER AFTER
WITH
AN EXPLANATION
OF THE
DIFFICULTIES BOTH IN LANGUAGE AND SENSE.

MY DEAR MOTHER,

MY DEARLY-HONOURED AND BELOVED NATIVE COUNTRY,

**THE
COUNTY OF STAFFORD:**

MORE ESPECIALLY TO

MY WORTHY AND WORTHILY-HONOURED FRIENDS,

**COLONEL JOHN BOWYER,
MICHAEL NOBLE,**

**COLONEL EDWARD LEIGH,
JOHN SWINFEN, AND**

SAMUEL TERRICKE, ESQUIRES;

MEMBERS OF THE HONOURABLE HOUSE OF COMMONS FOR THAT COUNTY.

A THREEFOLD cause hath induced me, most dear Mother, and most honoured Gentlemen, to engrave your names here: first, that this might be some expression and memorial of that affection and observance that I bear unto you and to your worth; which when I want ability to utter to the full, I would take any occasion and opportunity to intimate in any measure. Staffordshire hath ever her share in all my choicest thoughts; and those thoughts cannot but centre in those Gentlemen, in whom her choice hath so much centred. She is my mother, the mother of my birth, and the mother of my nearest interests; and you are her children, the children of her choice, and the children of her greatest trust: and as I cannot but highly affect her, to whom I have so much relation,—so I cannot but highly

* Omitted by Dr. Bright.

prize you, to whom she hath showed so much esteem and honour. She is to me, in mine own affections, as the England of England: and you are to her, by her own choice, as the Staffordshire of Staffordshire: and I can never forget her whom I so much affect, and can never enough honour you, whom she so much affecteth. By these dear and entire observances which I owe, and desire to show, to her and you,—I have been moved to set up your names on this mean monument, as a “*Memoriæ Sacrum*” for all to read, that I cannot but honour her and whom she doth honour,—and that worth that is so apparent, and she hath seen in you.

To this hath been added, in my thoughts, a second motive and induction to tender this ensuing piece unto the public view under your names,—and that is, because it having lost, and being sadly deprived of, that first-born and choicest child of Staffordshire, to whom it was intended, the renowned Earl of Essex,—I could not find to whom it should now address itself so properly, as to Staffordshire herself, and the children of her choice that do yet remain. The very writing of this passage, and the mention of that name, doth start my tears; and I should not, and could not, pass the memorial of the great Essex over, without bedewing his dust with some salt drops, were it not too public to mourn so in print: for “*ille dolet vere, qui sine teste dolet* :” and had I not bedewed that dust so full bitterly, and full many and many a time already. To him was the former part of this work dedicated and presented, and this intended; and in working up to a larger extent, than now it comes forth, the sad and dole-

ful tidings of his death shattered the work and workman almost all to pieces: and now that I gathered up some crumblings and shreds of it again, I know not, who hath so proper interest in it and claim to it (if it were any thing worth claiming) as yourselves. It is, I know, a thing not worth your owning; for it is above my power to produce any thing of that value: yet was his nobleness and goodness pleased to own its fellow; and my heart cannot but tell me, as constant experience of your respects doth witness to me, that your gentleness, and our common relation, will induce you to do the like. And this was a third induction to this dedication, because I could not but expect a fair acceptance and favourable construction from you, for country's sake, and for common interest's sake; though you can find nothing in what is here tendered to you, worth acceptance. My failings you, dear Mother, will pity, because they be your son's; and you, Gentlemen, because your countryman's: mine endeavours you will both accept, because your servant's: and this mine address you will not misconstrue, because a suppliant's. As your names are written in mine heart, and mine heart hath caused me to write them here,—so be pleased to write up among the names of those, that desire to observe and serve you,—and of those names that you read over with love and affection,—the worthless name, most dear Mother, and most honoured Gentlemen, of

Your most affectionate son, and

Your most cordial servant,

JOHN LIGHTFOOT.

London, 23 *July*, 1647.

TO
THE READER*.

I know the reader, that hath seen the first part of my Harmony of the Evangelists, will be ready, upon the sight of the second, to question, Why hath this part been so long in coming, and why is it so short, now it is come? I must first answer him in tears,—I have lost my dear Lord and renowned Patron, the great Earl of Essex:—and can any ask me, Why my studies are so slow and dull? I might plead diversions and employments, which continually did break my study; but the loss of the great Essex did break my heart. Did the reader but know, how many salt tears I have shed,—how many sad thoughts I have undergone,—and with how heavy a heart I have gone for this loss,—he would turn his questioning into pitying; and, it may be, some tender heart would break out into weeping with me. “Hectora flemus.”—Make my case thine own, tender reader; and then judge, whether I were not far more fit for mourning than for studying. To think what he was in himself,—what he was to me,—what he was to Staffordshire,—what he was to England;—and to think him dead,—and to think what we all lost in his death,—breaks my heart and my words; and I can only speak tears. It is no wonder my studies were spoiled, and this work went slowly on, when I had lost such a patron.

But, besides this answer of just grief and passion, I can give a second reason, why this part hath been so slow, and why it is so short;—and that is, because that, which should have been only a preface to it, hath outgrown it,—and, by excrescency, hath drawn nourishment and vigour from it. The harmonizing of the Old Testament is a work of that difficulty, and of that use, that, by the one I was necessitated, and by the other I was delighted, to withdraw from this work the most of that time and pains, that it should

* Omitted by Dr. Bright.

have had, and bestow it on that:—and so that younger brother got the birthright, ere I was aware.

To which I may add, that I did willingly cut off this part of the Harmony in so short a piece, because I would conclude with Christ's first Passover after his baptism. And now, henceforward, the succeeding parts (if the Lord permit their production) will terminate upon plain and pertinent periods; namely, to take up the three years coming of Christ's preaching, in three parts,—each part carrying the history from Passover to Passover; and, in a fourth and last part, to take up the story of the last Passover, and all the history that is laid in the evangelists after. These things are proposed, if the Lord permit and give assistance, in whose hands are all our persons, and all our times. To the gracious protection and disposal of those hands I leave the reader, and resign myself.

J. L.

23 July, 1647.

HARMONY OF THE
THE
HARMONY
OF
THE FOUR EVANGELISTS,

Second Part.

SECTION XI.

The second Adam tempted like the first, but overcometh in such Temptations, as in which the first was overcome.

MATT. IV.

Ver. 1. "THEN was Jesus led up [a] of the Spirit [b] into the wilderness, to be tempted of the devil.

2. And when he had fasted forty days and forty nights, he was afterward an hungred.

3. And when the tempter came to him, he said, 'If thou be the Son of God, command [c] that these stones [d] be made bread.'

4. But he answered and said, 'It is written,—Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word [e] that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.'

5. Then the devil taketh him up into the holy city [f], and setteth him on a pinnacle [g] of the temple;

6. And saith unto him, 'If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written,—He shall give his angels charge concerning thee; and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest, at any time, thou dash thy foot against a stone.'

7. Jesus saith unto him, 'It is written again,—Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.'

8. Again the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and showeth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them.

9. And saith unto him, 'All these things will I give thee [*h*], if thou wilt fall down and worship me [*i*].'

10. Then saith Jesus unto him, 'Get thee hence, Satan: for, it is written,—Thou shalt worship the Lord [*k*] thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.'

11. Then the devil leaveth him; and behold! angels came and ministered unto him.

MARK, I.

Ver. 12. "AND immediately the spirit driveth [*a*] him into the wilderness.

13. And he was there in the wilderness [*l*] forty days, tempted of Satan [*m*], and was with the wild beasts: and the angels ministered unto him.

LUKE, IV.

Ver. 1. "AND Jesus, being full of the Holy Ghost, returned from Jordan, and was led [*a*] by the spirit into the wilderness;

2. Being forty days tempted of the devil [*n*]: and in those days he did eat nothing: and, when they were ended, he afterward hungered.

3. And the devil said unto him, 'If thou be the Son of God, command that this stone [*d*] be made bread.'

4. And Jesus answered him, saying, 'It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word [*e*] of God.'

5. And the devil, taking him up into a high mountain, showed unto him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time.

6. And the devil said unto him, 'All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them: for that is delivered unto me, and to whomsoever I will give it.

7. If thou, therefore, wilt worship me, all shall be thine.'

8. And Jesus answered and said, 'Get thee behind me, Satan: for, it is written,—Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God; and him only shalt thou serve.'

9. And he brought him to Jerusalem, and set him on a pinnacle of the temple, and said unto him, 'If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down from hence:

10. For it is written,—He shall give his angels charge over thee to keep thee [*o*];

11. And in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone [*p*].'

12. And Jesus, answering, said unto him, ‘It is said,—Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.’

13. And when the devil had ended all the temptation, he departed from him for a season.”

[a] Each evangelist hath his peculiar expression, and each expression its peculiar meaning; though some translators do not much mind their differences: as the Syriac, that useth the same word in Matthew and Luke; and the Arabic, the same in Matthew and Mark; only either of them take it actively, in the one,—and passively, in the other:—1. Luke saith, *ἤγετο*, ‘He was acted or moved;’ ‘actus est,’ and ‘agebatur,’ in Beza and the Vulgar; intending the internal moving of the spirit within him: for so the manner of speech is used, Rom. viii. 14; Gal. v. 18. 2. Mark saith, *ἐκβαλλει*, the spirit ‘casteth,’ ‘bringeth,’ or ‘driveth, him out;’ for in these senses is the word used, Matt. xii. 35; Luke, ix. 40; John, x. 4; Gal. iv. 30; &c. And he implieth by it, first, his parting him from the company at Jordan: secondly, his sending him out upon his office and function; for so the word is also used, Matt. ix. 38: and, thirdly, it seemeth to denote some visible vehemency and rapture, wherewithal the spirit separated him from the company, as Philip was taken away from the eunuch, Acts, viii. 39. 3. Matthew saith, *ἀνέχθη*, ‘He was led up,’ as our English hath well rendered it, from the low grounds about Jordan, to the high mountains of the wilderness. Some conceive, he was rapt into the air, and there carried aloft till he came into the wilderness; which if it were so, the evil spirit imitated this act of the Holy Spirit, when he carried him in the air, to the pinnacle of the holy temple.

[b] The Syriac, in Matthew, addeth, ‘By the Holy Spirit:’ Luke saith, *ἐν πνεύματι*: where *ἐν* is put causally, as *ב* is, in Hebrew, very frequently; Psal. xxxiii. 6; Hos. i. 7; &c: so *ἐν*, in Matt. xii. 28: for this temptation of Christ was not in vision, as Ezekiel’s, carrying into the valley of dry bones was, Ezek. xxxvii. 1; where he saith of himself, *ἐξήγαγέ με ἐν πνεύματι Κύριος*, as the Seventy render it; but it was really done,—and Christ was bodily driven, or carried, into the wilderness:—and, therefore, Matthew’s *ὑπὸ πνεύματος*, and Luke’s *ἐν πνεύματι*, must, thus far, bear the same sense,—that they denote a real, and not a visionary, action; and the

power and activity of the Holy Ghost moving and driving our Saviour in it, and to it. Though Luke's *ἤγετο ἐν πνεύματι*, may more singularly express the internal motion, and Matthew's *ὑπὸ πνεύματος*, the external impulsions.

[c] The Greek reads it, "*say or speak to these stones,*" as Num. xx. 8: and accordingly it is rendered by the Syriac and Vulgar: for God's speaking is commanding; and his commanding is operative in things of this nature. And so, 'he spake,' or 'said,' and all things were made^a; which the Psalmist^b expresseth, "he commanded." And the devil doth purposely and pertinently use this phrase, because he saith, instantly before, "If thou be the Son of God;" and, if God speak, it must be done.

[d] The difference in number, used by the evangelists, the one saying, 'this stone,'—and the other, 'these stones,' is no strange thing in Scripture, but of common and familiar use; as, Gen. xxviii. 11: "He took of the stones of the place;" which, in ver. 18, is expounded, "He took the stone." And Luke sheweth, that Matthew's expression, 'these stones,' is to be understood for 'one of these stones:' as, Judg. xii. 7; "Jephthah was buried in the cities of Gilead;" that is, in one of the cities. And, 1 Sam. xviii. 21, "Thou shalt be my son-in-law in the two;" that is, in one of the two, &c. And that speech of Reuben^c seemeth to be, to a sense and construction, not very far from this kind, "slay my two sons;"—that is, 'slay two of my sons;' for Reuben had four sons at this time^d.

[e] In the Hebrew, in Deut. viii. 3, from whence these words are quoted, it is *על כל מוצא פי*, "By every thing that cometh out of the mouth;" without any determinate naming of 'a word:' but the Chaldee and the Seventy have rendered it, "by every *word* that proceedeth or cometh forth:" and Matthew useth the very words of the Septuagint. Luke gives the sense of *מוצא פי* rather than the very construction or translation of the words.—*מוצא שפת* is "God's promise," Psal. lxxxix. 34.

[f] 'The holy city,' was the common and ordinary name of Jerusalem; as, Isa. xlviii. 2, and lii. 1; Dan. ix. 16; Neh. xi. 1; Matt. xxvii. 53, &c: yea, when it was full of all abomination and corruption; yea, even when the story

^a Gen. i.

^b Psal. cxlviii. 5.

^c Gen. xlii. 37.

^d Gen. xlvi. 9.

is relating that it is crucifying Christ; as in the place last cited: yet it is so called, in regard of God's presence, and his worship, which he placed there.—Separists might do well to meditate a little upon this consideration. The shekel of Israel had an inscription, on the one side of it carrying this same title, though not in the very same words, ירושלם קדושה 'Jerusalem the Holy.' The Turks own the place by the same name and title at this day: and the Papist, in the same notion and nature. But when that worship and religion, and presence of God in them, which he himself had planted there, was removed,—then was Jerusalem no more holy than other places: nay, more accursed for their other abominations; and especially for crucifying the Lord of life. And the Lord buildeth up for himself, a new holy city, a new Jerusalem, when the old one is destroyed;—namely, a spiritual building, a city not made with hands, a church, under the gospel, when that, under the law, had undone themselves, Rev. xxi. 2, &c.

[g] Πτερύγιον ἱεροῦ: this is understood variously; but it seemeth to mean the battlements of the temple, wherewithal it was ledged round about; as, Deut. xxii. 8; called there מקנה 'a hedge,' or enclosure; as R. Solomon renders it. The Chaldee expresseth it by the Greek word, Θήκη, κρητή 'a case:' the Seventy, by Στεφάνη, 'a crown:' the Vulgar and Erasmus use 'Pinnaculum' here, as our English doth, meaning some spire or broach that shot up from the roof. Camerarius indifferently takes it for the top or highest part of the temple; be it pinnacle, battlement, spire, fane, or what else it would. The priests used to go to the top of the temple^e.

[h] This helpeth to construe the phrase in Luke, ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἅπασαν: that it is to be taken for the realms and kingdoms themselves, which Satan showed him, rather than for the dominion and rule over those realms. For that expression, which Matthew useth, "All the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them," of which Satan saith, "All these things will I give thee," Luke uttereth it, τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην, and τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν.

[i] The two evangelists' expressions laid together, may make this useful result and observation,—That if to worship before the devil, be to worship the devil (for, whereas Matthew saith, 'if thou worship me,'—Luke expresseth it, 'if

^e Talm. in Taanith. R. Sol. on Isa. xxii. 1,

thou worship before me'), sure to worship before an image, is to worship an image; whatsoever evasion Popery would make to the contrary: or else, let it show a reason of the difference.

[k] In the Hebrew, in Deut. vi. 13, and x. 20, from whence this citation is taken, it is,—1. "Thou shalt fear the Lord;" which the evangelist renders, "Thou shalt worship:" 2. The word *only*, in the second clause, is not extant. But, first, our Saviour applies the text close to the present occasion: for the devil had persuaded him to worship him: and he retorts the Scripture, so as to face the temptation most directly, and, since 'the fearing of God,' contains and includes all man's duty towards God,—be it what it will, whether in worship, or in holy conversation, and whether in worship, or in holy conversation, as was most pertinent and agreeable to the thing in hand. And so parallels might be showed in great variety; where one place of Scripture, citing another, doth not retain the very words of the portion cited, but doth, sometimes, change the expression to fit the occasion: as Matthew, ii. 23, translates Netzer,—'a branch,' in Isa. xi. 1,—'a man of Nazareth.' And that which is 'sorrows,' in Isa. liii. 4, he hath rendered 'sickness,' Matt. viii. 17; because he is there discoursing of Christ's healing diseases. And divers more of this nature, will the reader take up by his own observation, so that it is needless to insist upon examples. Secondly; Although the word *only* be not in the Hebrew text, yet is it in the Septuagint, in the place first cited; and it is most ordinary for the evangelists to follow that copy. And that translation hath warrantably added it, seeing (as Beza well observeth) so much is included in the emphatical particle *him*; and is also understood by comparing other places.

[l] Beza conceiveth, that the words 'in the wilderness,' might have been spared; because, that having mentioned immediately before, that 'the spirit drave him into the wilderness,' it had been enough to have added, 'and he was there forty days,' without any more repetition of the word 'wilderness' at all: and, which is equal to such a conceit, the Arabic and the Vulgar Latin have left the word *there* out, and read it only, "And he was in the wilderness." But the Syriac hath well reserved both; observing, belike, what they did not, that this duplication, or מלות שונות (as the Jews call

such passages), is a common and usual Hebraism; as Gen. xxxix. 23, "Joseph's master put him into prison, and he was there, in the prison," &c.

[m] There are three names of the devil in this story,—*Σατανᾶς*, *Διάβολος*, and *ὁ πειράζων*, 'Satan,' 'Devil,' and 'Tempter;' or 'Enemy,' 'Accuser,' and 'Tempter:' and they do very fitly and very fully set out the devil's actions and affections in reference to man: and here, all these hellish actions and affections are practised towards him, that is God himself.

[n] The Vulgar Latin reads it thus, "Forty days, and was tempted of the devil;" joining 'the forty days' to the story of the verse preceding, as that he was in the wilderness forty days, before any temptation at all began. "Agebatur (saith he) in spiritu in deserto diebus quadraginta, et tentabatur:" and, to the like sense, he seemeth to drive the same passage and phrase in Mark, translating it thus, "erat in deserto quadraginta diebus" [yea, he addeth, 'et quadraginta noctibus'] "et tentabatur." But the texts of both the evangelists is clear and facile; and sheweth, that Christ suffered some temptations for the forty days, as well as those three temptations, that are mentioned after them.

[o] The Chaldee paraphrast, on the ninety-first Psalm, out of which this allegation is produced, applieth the promises, made there, to Solomon; but Aben Ezra, to the days of the Messias.

[p] This phrase seemeth to allude to Balaam's miscarriage in his way^f. Now, the devil, in this quotation from the Psalm, doth visibly and palpably play legerdemain two ways. In the allegation itself, he omitteth this clause, "To keep thee in all thy ways:" for such an action, as he was now tempting our Saviour to, namely, to tempt the Lord, was none of the ways of Christ. And, secondly, his allegation reacheth not to take in the words that next follow, "Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder," &c: for those directly prophesy of Satan's own ruin and treading down; and he cannot find in heart to meddle with them.

Reason of the Order.

The juncture and connexion of the two stories of Christ's baptism, and of his temptation, and the speedy succeeding

^f Num. xxii. 25.

of the one to the other, is so clear and manifest, in all the evangelists, that it were but loss of time to go about to prove or confirm it: especially since Mark hath tied them so close together with the word 'immediately,' that it is impossible to put them asunder. But it is a difficulty that requireth some study and seriousness; viz. how to reconcile the two evangelists, Matthew and Luke, together, in their relating of this story of the temptation; they do so much differ in their order. For, whereas Matthew hath laid that temptation, that was on the pinnacle of the temple, for the second temptation,—and that upon the high mountain, for the last; Luke hath laid that upon the mountain, for the second,—and that upon the pinnacle, for the third. And, in the laying down their text, I have suffered each to retain his own order, and have not been so bold as to alter and transpose it.

Now, for the reconciling of the difference, and satisfying of the difficulty, let these things be taken into consideration:—

1. That the order, in which Matthew hath laid the temptation, is the proper method and order, in which they were done and acted. And this is plain, by those particles which he hath used to express the time; which Luke hath not done: as, ver. 5; "*Then* the devil taketh him:" and, ver. 8; "*Again* the devil taketh him:" which clearly methodize and rank the second temptation after the first; and the third, after the second.

2. That Luke was not punctual in setting down the order, since he saw Matthew had done it before; but he changeth and inverteth it for special reason.

3. The reason of his alteration may be conceived to be this:—He had, in the chapter and section preceding, laid the genealogy and proper pedigree of our Saviour, at his baptism; and had drawn his line up to Adam: and this he did in reference to, and in explanation of, that part of the promise made to Adam, "The seed of the woman." In this story of the temptations, and of Christ's victory over Satan in them, he illustrateth the other part of the promise, "Shall break the head of the serpent." Now, that he may the clearer explain that latter part, concerning Christ's breaking the serpent's head, he doth not only show, how he conquered the devil in his temptations, as our first parents were

conquered by him,—but he also giveth such a hint, by this dislocation of the story, that we might observe, that these temptations were agreeable to the temptations, by which we fell; and, that this second Adam overcame the devil, in such temptings, as in which the first Adam was overcome.

Our mother Eve had been tempted of the serpent, by “the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life^b.” By the lust of the flesh, for “the woman saw, that the tree was good for food:” by the lust of the eyes; for “she saw, that it was pleasant to look upon:” and by the pride of life; for she conceived, that “it was a tree to be desired to make one wise:” and she took of the fruit thereof, and did eatⁱ.

Accordingly was our Saviour assaulted at this time, by the same tempter:—1. He would have tempted him to lust of the flesh, when, perceiving him hungry, he moveth him to turn stones into bread. 2. To lust of the eyes, when he showed and offered to him, the glory and pomp of all the kingdoms of the earth. And, 3. To pride of life, when he would persuade him from the ordinary way of coming down from the top of the temple, but would have him to cast himself headlong, presuming upon a promise.

The order, laid down by Luke, is so point-blank correspondent to the order of those first temptations, that we may well conceive, that the reason of his ranking these in this method, is, that the reader might compare and consider the one from the other.

4. Now the reason, why the devil did not tempt our Saviour in the very same order and method that he tempted our first parents, is very difficult to determine: but this is plain to observe, that he tempted him first to works of power, ‘to make stones bread,’ and ‘to fly in the air;’ and when in these he could not prevail, then he tempted him to a work of sinful weakness,—viz. ‘to adore the devil.’ Such is the impudency of the devil, as even to cross himself in the tenor of his temptations; and, if he cannot speed in one, to take up another clean contrary to it, rather than to fail, and to go away without speeding in what he desireth, if it may be done.

^b As 1 John, ii. 16.

ⁱ Gen. iii. 6.

HARMONY AND EXPLANATION.

Our Saviour being installed into his function of the ministry by baptism, and by the unction of the Holy Ghost, as the priests under the law were into their office by washing and anointing^j,—he beginneth now to act no more as a private man, but as the great High-priest, the Redeemer, the Messias, and Captain of our salvation; and such a one is he held out in this story; and such a one is he offered to this combat by the Holy Ghost:—1. That the work of the redemption might begin to parallel the fall; for both of them were with temptations. 2. That Christ, from the very first entrance into his function, might be looked on as the subject of the promise^k: “That seed of the woman, that should break the head of the serpent” in the end, when he thus bruised him in the beginning. 3. That this beginning of his ministry, might vindicate and glorify his ministry all along, when “the prince of this world had come and found nothing in him.” And, 4. That a greater than Adam in innocency might be acknowledged here; for he, by temptation, had been overcome,—but this, in temptation, overcame. Other reasons of Christ being tempted, referring to men, may be given divers:—As, 1. To show, that even the holiest of men, cannot expect to be free from temptations. 2. That Christ might teach us how to combat against the temptations of Satan,—namely, with fasting, prayer, and the word of God. 3. To show that we are to overcome through him, who overcame temptations for us, as he overcame death for us. 4. For our assurance of help and succour in our trials, since our Redeemer was tempted like unto us^l.

Luke, iv. 1: “And Jesus, being full of the Holy Ghost.”] For the better understanding of these words, there are two things very material to take into consideration. The first is, what need there was of Christ’s being now filled with the Holy Ghost, when ‘all the fulness of the Godhead’ had dwelt in him hitherto. And, secondly, in what the fulness of the Holy Ghost that was in Christ, these gifts that were in him, did differ from that fulness, and from those, that were in other men.

For the first, it is to be observed; 1. That by the term

^j Lev. viii. 6. 12.

^k Gen. iii. 15.

^l As Heb. iv. 15. See Aquin. part. 3. quæst. 41. art. 1.

the ‘Holy Ghost,’ is to be understood the prophetic gifts, wherewithal Christ was filled, for the preaching and publishing of the gospel,—as, the revealing of the will of God, and working miracles. The expression רוח חקודש, or ‘the Holy Ghost,’ is a phrase and manner of speech used by the Jews in their writings, and very common and frequent there, and from them must the sense of it be explained, for from them it is taken; and most commonly and constantly used in their sense in the New Testament. Now, the Jewish authors do constantly mean by it the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, which he bestowed upon prophets and prophetic men, enabling them for that employment, unto which they were called.

As if we should go about to multiply examples from them to this purpose, we might do it infinitely.

“The Holy Ghost (say they) was one of the five things that were wanting in the second temple^m.”

“Thou hast showed, that the Holy Ghost dwelleth not on thee, to know that I am not drunkⁿ.”

“The Holy Ghost was gone from Eli; therefore, prophecy came to Samuel^o.”

“The Holy Ghost was born in him from that day and forward; and he uttered psalms and songs by the Holy Ghost, that was born in him; for under this general term ‘the Spirit of the Lord,’ is the Holy Ghost and the Spirit of power, or strength, understood^p.”

“The Holy Ghost rested on the false prophet^q.”

“Our wise men say, Before Elias was taken away, the Holy Ghost was in Israel; when he was taken away, the Holy Ghost departed^r.”

In all which speeches, and in divers others which might be produced, it is apparent, that the Jews, by this phrase, ‘the Holy Ghost,’ do constantly and continually intend prophetic gifts, wherewith men and women were endued, either for the managing of some public employment to which they were called, or for the suiting to some singular and special occasion wherewithal they met. And in this sense is the expression most constantly to be taken in the New Testament [when it speaketh not of the third person in the Trinity itself]; as Luke, i. 15. 41. 67; John, vii. 3. 9; Acts, ii. 4;

^m Massecheth Joma, cap. 1; cited by R. Sol. and Kimchi, on Hag. i. 8.

ⁿ Rasi on 1 Sam. i. 13.

^o D. Kimchi on 1 Sam. iii. 2.

^p Idem. on 1 Sam. xvi. 13.

^q Idem. on 1 Kings, xiii. 20.

^r R. Sam. Laniade, on 2 Kings, ii.

viii. 18; x. 44; xiii. 52; and xix. 2; and in very many other places. And so is it to be understood here,—that Christ being now to enter upon the public ministry of the gospel, and to act as the great Prophet of his church and people, he is, at his baptism, anointed, and ever after filled with the gifts of the Holy Ghost, befitting so great a work, and befitting so great a prophet.

Now, 2. It is to be observed, that these prophetic gifts, that the Holy Ghost bestowed upon some particular persons, did, really and very far, differ from the grace of sanctification, which he bestoweth upon all his saints: they might indeed sometimes be, and very often they were, in one and the same person,—but they were very far from being one and the same thing. For,

1. Prophetical gifts were sometimes in wicked and profane men; as in Balaam, the false prophet at Beth-el, Judas, &c.

2. These were given for the benefit of others, rather than for his own that had them; but sanctifying grace is given for his benefit chiefly, that doth enjoy it.

3. They did not make a man any whit the holier towards God, but only the more able for some occasions amongst men.

So that, by this expression, “Jesus, being full of the Holy Ghost,” is not intended any addition of grace or sanctity, which he had not before,—but the collation of prophetic qualifications, at the descent of the Holy Ghost upon him, which he had not till then. For though, by the union of the human nature to the Godhead, that nature did partake of glorious and most excellent perfections, arising and resulting from that union,—yet did it not partake of these gifts or perfections, that we have in hand; because these were not properly fruits of that union, but of a donation: and not things conducing to the satisfaction of God in the work of redemption, but to the satisfaction of men in his work of the ministry. The proper fruits of that union, were the qualifying of the person of Christ so, as that he should be absolutely without sin, that he might exactly perform the law, and might be able to satisfy God’s justice, and overcome death; for these were the proper ends and reasons, for which such a union was required. But to work miracles, to expound difficulties, to heal diseases, to teach divinity, to foretell things to come, and the like, were not so properly the fruit of that union; for

even mere men had been enabled to do the same: nor did they so directly tend to the most proper end of the incarnation; namely, the satisfaction of God's justice, as to the instruction, conviction, benefit, and advantage, of men. And, therefore, although the human nature of Christ, through the uniting of it to the Godhead, did abound in all holiness, and wisdom, and graces, as to the knowing of God, and the best things,—to the enjoyment of the vision of God, and communion with him,—to the being and persisting absolutely without the least corruption,—to the entire performing of the whole law, and to a non-possibility of committing sin; all which capacities tended towards the satisfaction of God's justice and man's redemption; yet, for the ministration of the gospel, and for his working upon the bodies, minds, and affections, of men, by teaching, preaching, and working miracles, he is endued with the immediate gifts of the Spirit [as it was the way of God to deal with prophets and prophetic men]; which gifts did not so properly accrue from the union of the two natures, as from the unction of the Spirit; the result of the union of the two natures being more properly acceptance with God in the work of redemption, and the fruits of this unction being to the acceptance with men in the work of the ministry. And whereas it is not to be denied, but that Christ, before the Holy Ghost came upon him at his baptism, had the power of miracles and prophetic wisdom in him, as appeareth by his disputing with the doctors at twelve years old,—this was through the fulness of the Holy Ghost, that was in him even from his mother's womb, as it was, and much more than it was, with John the Baptist^r; and that with this difference from what it is now; that it was then upon him as one to be ordained,—and now upon him, as ordained already to the ministry.

Now the difference of the fulness of the Holy Ghost in Christ from other men, who are also said to have been filled with the Holy Ghost^s, may appear in these particulars:—

First; In the measure, which may be measured by consideration of the difference of the persons, and of their employments: for Christ was more capable, by infinite degrees, of the fulness of the Holy Ghost, than mere men were, or could be; and his employment being also so infinitely beyond the employment of men, the measure of the Holy

^r Luke, i. 15.^s As, Luke i. 67. Acts, vi. 3.

Ghost's fulness in him must needs be accordingly beyond all measure.

Secondly; In the manner and vigour of acting. The power of the prophets in working of miracles was exceeding great indeed, and wondrous, and their descrying and discovering the will of God and things to come, was exceeding wonderful and sublime; but they could neither do nor tell all things; nor could they act upon all occasions, but had always their bounds, and had sometimes a recess of the Spirit, or departure of it from them. As Isaac can see, what shall befall Jacob and Esau many hundred years after, yet cannot know Jacob from Esau, when he is in his arms:—and Jacob can tell, what shall become of all his sons in the last time to come; yet cannot tell what is become of his best son, Joseph, in his own time, for thirteen years together.

So Moses hath power over Egypt; yet hath not power over his own stammering: and the prophet at Beth-el can command the altar, that it rent itself, but cannot command the lion not to rent him.

Thus, to this great gift of prophecy on men, as to the ocean, God set its bound, which it might not pass, and so far might the operating of it go, and might go no farther; but with Christ, it was not so. He could work what miracles he would,—when he would, how he would, and on whom he would; he could reveal all truths, resolve all doubts, clear all difficulties, know all thoughts, and had no limit of the vigour and acting of the Spirit upon him, but his own will.

§ “Was led by the spirit into the wilderness.”] Namely, into the wilderness of Judea. For, 1. That was in mention in the story next preceding^t; and a wilderness being here spoken of, without any farther mention what wilderness it was, none can so properly be understood as that of Judea, which was last named before. 2. It is said by Luke, that “Jesus returned from Jordan:” by the word *returned*, importing, that he came back [when he went to his temptation] on the same side Jordan, on which he was baptized. Now, that the wilderness of Judea lay on that side, is more evident than needeth any demonstration. Chemnitius, indeed, hath supposed this wilderness, where our Saviour was tempted, to have been the great desert of Horeb, or Sinai: and he

^t Matt. iii. 2, 3.

giveth these three reasons for it:—1. Because other wildernesses have their distinguishing titles,—as, of Ziph^u; Shur^v; En-gedi^w, &c; but this wilderness of Horeb is called ‘the wilderness,’ by a special emphasis, without any other addition; and so is the wilderness, mentioned in this story. But this is easily answered; that it wants its distinctive title here, because it was named by it a little before, and called ‘the wilderness of Judea.’

2. Because, saith he, Mark saith, that Christ, in this wilderness, ‘was with the wild beasts.’ Now in other wildernesses, there are either dwellings of men here and there, or they are not altogether remote from the converse of men; but in the great desert of Horeb there were only wild beasts, as there are mentioned to have been here.

Ans. Mark, when he saith, Christ was with wild beasts, doth not, therefore, enforce, that that wilderness was without either men or dwellings; but, first, that Christ, for that time, avoided both the one and the other, and kept himself in the wildest places, and most retired from human society. And, secondly, the evangelist seemeth to regard rather the state of Christ, than the state of the place: and to show Christ to be the second Adam, as in the temptation which he was now about,—so in his safety and security among the wild beasts [as Adam in innocency had been], and they hurt him not. The wilderness of Judea had, indeed, both cities, and villages, and dwellings of men, in it; but, withal, it had some places wild in it, without any such habitations, and it had wild beasts in it in those places^x.

3. By this supposal, he addeth, that this wilderness, where Christ was tempted, was the great desert of Horeb, there is a fair answerableness found out, between this story, and the story of Israel in that place, and betwixt this fasting of Christ, and of Moses, and Elias, in the same desert. *Answer:* It is true, there would be so, indeed; but the being of the thing cannot be grounded upon this correspondency, but this correspondency must be built upon the thing, first found so to be: and if this may argue for Horeb desert, we may as well argue for Judea wilderness; for there the sore trials of David, under the persecution of his enemies, and otherwise, may be as fit parallels to harmonize with this

^u 1 Sam. xxiii. 14.^v Exod. xv. 22.^w 1 Sam. xxiv. 1.^x 1 Sam. xvii. 28. 34. 2 Sam. xxiii. 20. Jer. xlix. 19.

temptation, as Israel's being in that desert; see 1 Sam. xvii. 34, and xxiii. 14. 19. 24, and xxiv. 1; Psal. lxi, in title, &c.

Mark, i. 13: "And was there, forty days, tempted."] For these forty days together, Satan was tempting him invisibly; and did not yet assume any visible or conspicuous shape, which at the end of forty days he did: and so is Matthew to be understood, when he saith, "The tempter came to him;" that is, in an apparent and visible form.

Now, if we look upon the time and place, and Christ's present posture, we may see what materials or occasions the devil had to frame these his invisible temptations of, all this while.

First; The time of the year, was from about the middle of the month Tisri, six weeks forward, that is, from the beginning of our October, till about the tenth of our November, and then was the cold increasing, the nights growing long, and the winter driving on apace;—but very comfortless subsisting in the open plain of a desert wilderness.

Secondly; The place of our Saviour's residence all this while, be it where it will in the wilderness of Judea, whether two miles from Jericho, or at Quarantania, as it is pointed out by some; or farther southward along the banks of the Dead Sea, as the more desert place; or wheresoever else,—it was in the company and danger of wild beasts, and no human company near him to comfort him, nor house to shelter him.

Thirdly; His posture in this time and place was not only in a fasting, but in an impossibility of getting sustenance unless by miracle; in solitude, in want of company, in want of necessaries, and in a condition, that made a life as comfortless, as likely might be.

Upon these outward occasions, as fit opportunities for such a matter, Satan would be busy with his suggestions to inject them into Christ, if it had been possible, either to have moved him from that resolved work, upon which he was,—or to have moved him to the acting or entertaining of something, which should not have been.

And herein did these forty days and nights' fasting of our Saviour, exceedingly outgo the like-dated fastings of Moses and Elias. For he did not only fast, but he was in continual watching and constant combat with Satan; and did not so much as enjoy the repose of his body, or of his

thoughts, in rest and contemplation, as Moses and Elias had sweetly done in their fasts, without such disturbance.

Compare the combat in 1 Sam. xvii. 16.

Luke, iv. 2: “And, in those days, he did eat nothing.”] Matthew mentioneth the nights of his fasting, as well as the days, that it might be distinguished from the ordinary fastings of other men, who, though they ate nothing of all day, yet at night they did^y. But the fast in Shushan was for three days and nights^z. Now, this long and miraculous fast of Christ was not for imitation, no more than were the like of Elias and Moses; but, as theirs was, so was this, for another end: for as Moses fasted, three times, forty days and forty nights at his giving of the law, and settling of religion, that the authority of the one, and the honour of the other, might be the more advanced,—and as Elias fasted forty days and forty nights at his restoring of decaying prophecy, and beginning of a reformation, that the one and the other might be the more dignified in the hearts of the people;—upon this very consideration, that the agents in these things, did, as it were, for a preface to the acting of them, lead so angelical and miraculous a life for so long a time.

So was this like action of our Saviour, for the greater honour and authority of the gospel, which he was now to preach; when he that preached it, had led so long the life of an angel, without meat and drink, had foiled the devil upon the greatest advantages imaginable, and had dwelt among the den of wild beasts, and was unhurt by them. Compare Isa. xi. 6.

Thus did John the Baptist begin the gospel with wondrous abstemiousness, and Christ with miraculous abstinence,—both of them thereby not only honouring the gospel, which they preached,—but also thereby instructing them to whom they preached it:—1. That ‘the kingdom of heaven is not of meats and drinks.’ 2. That ‘man is not to live by bread only, but by the word of God.’ And, 3. That the liberty of the gospel is not licentiousness, but liberty of another nature.

§ “And when they were ended, he afterward hungred.”] It is not so said either of Moses or Elias, though the same thing were true likewise of them; but it is expressed thus of Christ:—1. To evidence his humanity. 2. And chiefly,

^y 1 Sam. xiv. 24. 2 Sam. i. 12, &c.

^z Esth. iv. 16.

to give light unto the story following ; namely, to show that Satan took occasion for his first proposal, to turn stones into bread, from Christ's hungering. And, 3. That this and the first temptation might be paralleled, where Satan assaulted Eve ; when she now began to hunger, and it was eating time.

Matt. iv. 3 : “ And when the tempter came to him.”] Now is the seed of the woman and the serpent met visibly together, and the enmity, which was set betwixt them from the first day of Adam, is now breaking into an open combat. And the evangelist, in the epithet, ‘ the tempter,’ doth plainly call us to take notice of the first temptation, that occasioned the fixing of that enmity. The devil now appeareth to Christ in a visible shape, as he had done to Eve ; but in what appearance, the text is silent. It is most likely, like an angel of light ; and, as she was deceived by him, in taking him for a good angel, in the trunk of the serpent, so he goeth now about to deceive Christ also, in the representation of a glorious angel. For, in that he requireth Christ to worship him, and promiseth him all the kingdoms of the world, it is very unlikely that he carried the image of a mere plain simple man, or of any brute beast ; for either of them was most improper to make any such overture ; but that he carried indeed a human shape, but with that lustre, majesty, and gloriousness, that the holy angels used to appear in^a. For that the devil can transform himself into such a fashion and garb, the apostle doth tell us.

§ “ He said, ‘ If thou be the Son of God.’ ”] He tempteth Christ under the notion of his two natures,—twice in reference to his Godhead, ‘ to turn stones into bread,’ and ‘ to fly in the air,’ works of divine power ;—and once in reference to his manhood, to fall down and worship him for worldly preferment, an act of human sinfulness and weakness. When the devil doth twice use this expression, “ If thou be the Son of God,”—it argueth not that he was ignorant who Christ was [for the miracle of his birth, his adoration by the wise men, his wisdom at twelve years old, the voice from heaven, and his safety among wild beasts at this time, show that impossible] ; but, concluding the thing itself to be so, he argueth from it to persuade Christ to act as the Son of God, and to do things miraculously. And the *if*, in his speech, is not so much of doubting, as of assurance ;

^a Judg. xiii. 6.

as the *if*, in those words of Lamech, “If Cain shall be avenged seventy-fold;” and he forceth it as the consequence upon a thing undoubted, ‘Seeing thou art the Son of God, as the voice from heaven did proclaim thee, it is very agreeable to thy so being, that thou shouldest exert thy divine power, and command these stones into bread for the satisfying thy hunger.’ And so in the other temptation, that carrieth the same front, ‘Seeing thou art the Son of God, it is very fit thou shouldest act according thereunto, and not go down the stairs as men do, but cast thyself headlong, and show thy power.’ In both which temptations, though a close persuasive to distrust God’s provision for him in the wilderness, to rely too much upon second causes, and to presume without warrant upon a promise, be included,—yet Satan’s main bent and aim is, to move him to act according to the dictate and direction of the devil. And, as he had persuaded Eve from the commandment of God, to follow his advice, so would he fain do Christ, from that work and injunction which God had laid upon him, for the ministry, and for man’s redemption,—to do things tending nothing at all to that purpose, but rather to vain-glory and self-exalting; and the devil had had enough, if he could have moved the Redeemer to have acted any thing upon his instigation. Ignatius Martyr, Hilary, and others of old; and Beza, Chemnitius, some others of late, suppose that Satan knew not yet the mystery of the incarnation, no more than the disciples did till after the resurrection; but that he proposeth this, ‘If thou be the Son of God,’ as doubting of the truth of the thing, and seeking to be resolved in it: nay, that by the phrase, ‘the Son of God,’ is to be understood, and was so in Satan’s apprehension, only a very holy, and an extraordinary qualified man; as, whereas the centurion calls Christ ‘the Son of God^b, Luke^c expresseth it only ‘a righteous man.’

Answer 1. It is most true, indeed, that the mystery of the incarnation is a mystery most high and deep, and which created understandings cannot fathom; and that the disciples were exceedingly ignorant of it, till more than flesh and blood revealed it to them. But yet, for all this, the angels, good and bad, might know the truth of the thing, though they could not reach the mystery of it; and the disciples

^b Matt. xxvii. 54.^c Chap. xxiii. 47.

have some light of it before, though they had the more perfect understanding of it after, the resurrection; as see Matt. xvi. 16. The devil was not ignorant of the angel's proclaiming him 'Christ the Lord,' or 'Jehovah^d;' of an angel's and God's proclaiming him 'The Son of God^e;' of the prophet's calling him 'Jehovah^f,' and 'the mighty God, and Father of eternity^g;' and a hundred such expressions as these, which could not but put him past all questioning, who it was with whom he dealt.

2. It is true, indeed, that the church and people of God are called 'his sons;' but it will be hard to find this applied to any one particular person, or single man, in all the Scripture. That in 2 Sam. vii. 14,—Psal. lxxxix. 27, is readily known to be spoken of Christ; and that in Luke iii. 38, we have explained before.

3. It is likewise true, that whereas the centurion, in Matthew, is brought in, saying, 'This was the Son of God,'—Luke hath brought him, saying, 'This was a righteous,' or 'just man:' but must it therefore follow, that he took him not for 'the Son of God,' but that he called him so, only because he was a holy man? In very many of the evangelists' various expressions, we are not always to take the one to mean the other; but we must take them both in their proper sense, to make up the full sense, as will fall to be observed in divers places: and so is it to be done here. The centurion and his company, upon the sight of the wonders that attend our Saviour's death, concluded, that not only he was a most holy man, but some rose higher, and "sure (say they) he was the Son of God." Compare and examine the places.

Now, the daring impudence of the devil, thus to assault and assail him whom he knew to be the Son of God, will be the less wondrous and strange, if we consider [jointly with his pride, desperate wickedness, and malice] the ground that he might think he had to undertake such an attempt as this, to go about to foil him, who, his own heart told him, was 'the Son of God.' And that was from those words of God in the garden to him, when, upon the denunciation upon him, that the seed of the woman should break his head; yet God tells him withal, that 'he should bruise his

^d Luke, i. 16, 17, and ii. 11.

^f Jer. xxiii. 6.

^e Luke, i. 35, and iii. 22.

^g Isa. ix. 6.

heel.' Hence did his impudence take its rise to do and dare, what he did and dared, at this time; and the having this very passage in one's eye and consideration, upon the reading of this story of the temptation, will help exceedingly to clear, enlighten, and explain it. For, whereas two main scruples may arise about this temptation [besides this that we have in hand, of the devil's daring to assault Christ thus]; namely, how chance it was now, and not before,—and why it is said by Luke, after these temptations, that 'the devil departed from him for a season;'—the consideration of this thing doth give so much satisfaction to both these doubts. For, 1. It is, indeed, some matter of wonder, that Christ should live to thirty years, and the devil never attempt to tempt him of so long a time, but should now come to assail him, when he had a testimony from heaven that he was the Son of God, and when he had the fulness of the Spirit in him above measure, which were greater disadvantages to Satan than ever;—but the reason was, because that now Christ was offered to the devil in an apparent manner, which he never had been before, to try that mastery with the devil about 'breaking and bruising head and heel:' and the devil, having an assurance that he should bruise his heel, undertakes the combat, and dares be thus impudent. And, 2. When he saw that he could not prevail with him this way to bruise him, namely, by temptation, he departs from him for a season,—till he can find an opportunity for another way to do it; namely, by open and actual persecution.

§ "Command that these stones be made bread."] To change the form of a creature, is the greatest miracle, as coming nearest to creating; and, therefore, when the power of miracles was first given, the first that was wrought, was transforming^h. And such a one was the first, that was wrought by our Saviourⁱ. The devil, therefore, assaying Christ in a work of wonder, trieth him in one of this nature; and, when he cannot move him to show his power upon another creature, in changing the form of it, in this temptation, he seeketh, in the next, to move him to show his power upon his own body, in altering the quality of it, and making it fly.

Now, to inquire what sins they were that the devil would have persuaded him to in this temptation, in turning stones

^h Exod. iv. 3.

ⁱ John, ii. 9.

into bread,—whether to gluttony, or distrust of providence, or what else,—is not so material and pertinent, as to consider, why he tried him first by such a manner of temptation. And the satisfaction to this is facile and obvious;—namely, 1. Because he took advantage of his present hungering. And, 2. Because he had sped so successfully to his own mind, by a temptation about a matter of eating, with the first Adam, he practiseth that old manner of his trading with the second.

Ver. 4: “It is written.”] This is the first speech, that proceeded from our Saviour’s mouth, since his entrance into his ministerial function, that is upon record; and, though it be very short, yet is it very material for observation of these things:—

1. That the first word, spoken by Christ in his ministerial office, is an assertion of the authority of Scripture.

2. That he opposeth the word of God, as the properest encounterer against the words of the devil.

3. That he allegeth Scripture, as a thing undeniable and uncontrollable by the devil himself.

4. That he maketh the Scripture his rule, though he had the fulness of the Spirit above measure.

§ “Man shall not live by bread only, but,” &c.] He doth, most properly and divinely, produce this place of Moses^k; it being a lesson which the Lord had read to Israel, when they had fallen into a temptation, not much unlike to this that Satan would have tripped Christ in at this time. Now, the sense of the text alleged is somewhat controverted: some take it to mean, that ‘man hath not only a life of the body to look after, which is sustained by bread; but also, and rather, a life of the soul, which is supported by the word of God:’ and some again, by ‘the word of God,’ understand ‘the word of doctrine;’ others, ‘the word of God’s power, providence, and decree; as meaning that man’s life doth not depend upon bread only,—but that God can support and sustain it by other means, as he shall see fit.’ Any of which carry a most proper, and a most considerable, truth along with them. But the most facile interpretation of these words, and the most agreeable to the context in Moses, with which they lie, is, by ‘every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God,’ to understand ‘God’s command-

^k Deut. viii. 3.

ments ;' by the observing of which a man shall live, prosper, and it shall go well with him : for to this sense the first verse of that chapter in Deuteronomy speaketh,—“ All the commandments that I command thee this day, shall ye observe to do, that ye may live,” &c. Now our Saviour retorteth this in this sense, against the devil's temptation, that incited him to have turned stones into bread ; 1. To show that it was his meat and drink to do the will of him that sent him, and to finish his work¹. And, 2. That obedience of God's commandments is more properly the way to live, than by the use of the creature.

Ver. 5 : “ Then the devil taketh him up.”] Here it is controverted, whether this were done really and truly, or only in vision and apparition. And there be that assert the latter, conceiving that Christ was brought no otherwise to the pinnacle of the temple, or to the high mountain, than Jeremy went to Euphrates to hide his girdle^m, or Ezekiel slept on his right, and left sideⁿ, &c. or other things of this nature mentioned in Scripture, which, it is past all denial, were done only in vision^o.

But that these transportings of our Saviour from place to place, were really and actually done, even in the body, and not in vision,—may be strongly confirmed by these considerations :—

1. Otherwise they had been no temptations, which the evangelists tell plainly that they were : for what had it been for Christ, to have seen a thousand of such things as these in a vision, and to have nothing more to do with them, but only see them ;—what temptation could this be to him ?

2. The next place that we hear Christ was in, after the temptations were finished, was beyond Jordan, as shall be showed in the next section : now it will be hard to find, how he was got, instantly after his temptations, to the other side Jordan, if he were not carried thither in the next temptation after this, that is now in hand. For, in the temptation before this, he is in the wilderness of Judea ; in this temptation, he is at Jerusalem, on the top of the temple ; and in the next, on the top of a high mountain ; and the next tidings of him after, is, that he is beyond Jordan.

Now this taking him up, was bodily, and locally, and really, the devil catching him up into the air, and carrying

¹ As John, iv. 34.

^m Jer. xiii.

ⁿ Ezek. iv.

^o Vid. Jansen. in loc.

him in the air to the battlements of the temple, and from thence, in the next temptation, to the high mountain. And here may the reader fix his meditations upon four or five material things, very pertinent and profitable to consider of upon this passage.

As, 1. The horrid impudency of the tempter, that cannot but suppose him the Son of God, and yet dare assail him as the basest of men.

2. The wonderful humiliation of the Redeemer, that was even now proclaimed the Son of God from heaven, and now is hurried by the devil in the face of heaven.

3. The power of evil spirits over men's bodies, if they be permitted, and let loose, to exercise their power upon them.

4. The constant and continued providence showed in our preservation, that we are not hurried away bodily by Satan every moment, who is thus busy here even with our Redeemer, who was the Son of God.

5. That in all the Scripture there is no mention of the like story, that the devil ever thus carried any man in the air, unless he had first bodily possessed him. For having first done so, it is said of the poor wretch among the Gadarenes, "That he was driven of the devil into the wilderness." And so we have observed elsewhere, that it is probable that the devil took Judas into the air, and there strangled him, and threw him down to the earth, and burst out his bowels; for the devil was bodily in him before: but for one not possessed to be so transported from place to place, by the evil spirit,—is a thing, that hath no parallel in all the Scripture from end to end. Now whether it be not probable that the devil would have possessed our Saviour bodily, if he could have done it,—and, when he could not do it, betook himself to this violent rapture of him,—be it also referred to the reader's consideration.

§ "Into the holy city, and setteth him on a pinnacle of the temple."] There are two main scruples and questions arise out of these words:—1. Why the devil bringeth Christ to this place in this temptation: and, 2. Whether his flying in the air, and standing on the temple, were visible, or no.

As to the first; It cannot be doubted, but something more was in the devil's thoughts when he brought our Saviour hither, than merely his precipitation, or casting down headlong, or flying in the air: for had that been all, he

might have found promontories, rocks, precipices, by hundreds; from whence, to have got him cast down, would have served the turn, as well as from hence, if his precipitation had been all that was intended and aimed at. But certainly there was some reflecting in Satan's mind upon the very place, as well as upon the very thing. And that being apprehended what it was, if it be possible to apprehend it, it will help to resolve both the questions at once. Conjecture is all that we can go upon here; and it is better to conjecture at Satan's mind, in such a thing as this, than to be acquainted in it; and in a matter of this nature, if one fail in conjecture, it is as excusable on that hand, as it is difficult to hit aright on the other.

1. Therefore it may be conceived, that the devil, according to his constant practice, would make the utmost advantage he could of his deceits in this passage and temptation: and that he meant not only evil to our Saviour, whom he had in hand, but some delusion also to the men of Jerusalem, amongst whom he brought him. For why should he take him from the solitude of the wilderness, into the middle of a city, if he meant no more than what he might have equally acted in that solitariness? or why should he set him upon the temple, if he intended no more, than what he might have done upon any precipice in the desert?

2. It seemeth, therefore, and is very probable, that our Saviour, as he flew in the air, and as he stood on the temple, was visible and conspicuous to the eyes of the people: and that Satan acted thus, that the people might be deluded with some misapprehensions concerning him. And truly I cannot but conjecture, that he intended to deceive them with misprision concerning Elias, who was so much in their thoughts and expectation, to come personally as the forerunner of the Messiah: for he having been rapt away into the air, and so into heaven, when the Lord took him from the earth, as is related in the story of his translation^p, how readily might the people have their thoughts on him, when they saw a man in a mantle flying in the air, and taking his pitch upon the temple, and away again? and this they might be deceived in the rather, because of the misconstruction which they blindly made of those words of the prophet^q, “of the angel of the covenant coming to the temple,”—which they

^p 2 Kings, ii.

^q Mal. iii. 1.

understand of Elias^r. But it will be said, 'what could Satan gain by this deceit?'—Why, this; that they would be confirmed in the mistake of Elias's personal coming at the last converse among them; and so the preaching of the Baptist, and the appearing of Christ after him, would be the less regarded.

3. Now the acting of the devil, in reference to Christ, affords us these considerations:—

1. That whereas, in his former temptation, he would have injected into Christ diffidence and despair in God, now would he do the clean contrary, and instigate him to presumption. Then would he have suggested, that God was mindless of him, and that there was no trust to be had in providence; for he must either turn stones into bread, or be without: but now he will have him to cast all upon providence and promises, presumptuously, and neither to use any means, nor regard any rule.

2. That the devil doth here somewhat parallel his first temptation of our first parents; for that was in the garden, a place of happiness,—this is on the temple, the place of holiness: that, in the paradise of delight; this, in the paradise of religion.

3. That though the devil could set Christ on the top of the temple, yet could he not throw him off. Our Saviour refused not to suffer him to bring him to a temptation, but he would not suffer him to have the least power over him in it; either to persuade him into the least sin, or to cast him into the least danger.

4. Whereas Christ had used Scripture to him before, he useth Scripture to Christ now; and so goes about to assault him with his own weapon.

5. That he might the more feasibly cast him upon a presumptuous reliance on the guard of angels, he hath now brought him to a place, as likely to have angels ready about it, as any place under heaven: for where might they more readily be thought to be, than about the temple?

What part of the temple it was, that Christ was set upon at this time, it is in vain to go about to determine: whether on some turret of it, as is conceived by some; or on the battlement-ledge, as by others; or on some of the flying fanes, as by a third sort; or on the sharp broaches that were

set there to keep off birds, as by a fourth ; it is as little material, as it is little determinable : only take this testimony of Josephus, concerning the terrible height of some part of the temple, and then be it left to ruminate upon. He speaking concerning the south side of the temple, and of ‘ the king’s porch’ there, he saith thus ; “ It was one of the most renowned works under the sun ; for there being a great depth of a valley, even not to be seen to the bottom of, if any one above looked down : Herod raised a vast height of a porch over it ; so that if any one from the roof of it looked down (*σκοτιδιναῖαν οὐκ ἐξικουμένης τῆς ὀψεως εἰς ἀμέτρητον τὸν βυθὸν*), his head would be giddy, his sight not reaching to the unmeasurable depth^s.”

Ver. 8 : “ Again, the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain.”] It is as undeterminable, what mountain this was, as it is what part of the temple it was, that he set him upon, and it is as little material : only this is conceivable, upon good probability, that this mount was beyond Jordan eastward, because the first appearing of Christ, after this, amongst men, is at Bethabara on that side^t. Now, whether it were Pisgah, Nebo, Horeb, or what else, is but lost labour to make inquiry, because we are sure we cannot find : only this again is worth our thoughts,—to compare together the being of Moses in the mount with God, and the being of Christ in a mount with Satan : and the Lord’s showing to Moses, from a high mount, all the kingdoms of Canaan, and saying, ‘ All these will I give to the children of Israel ;’—and the devil’s showing to Christ, all the kingdoms of the earth, and saying, ‘ All these will I give thee,’ &c.

§ “ And sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world.”] Here are two things mainly considerable :—1. The object represented to the eyes of Christ : and, 2. The manner of Satan’s representing it. The first, the text expresseth to be “ all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them :” upon which, if we come to ponder, by weighing and considering the state of the world at this time, it will appear, that the object that the devil presented Christ withal in this spectacle, was Rome, her empire and glory. For, 1. That empire is called by the very name of ‘ all the world,’ Luke ii. 1 ; and the very same word, that Luke useth to ex-

^s Antiq. lib. 15. cap. 5.

^t John, i. 28.

press it there, he useth here; ἀπογράφεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην there; and πᾶσας τὰς βασιλείας τῆς οἰκουμένης here.

2. Where was there any pomp, or worldly glory, to be seen any where upon all the earth at this time, but what belonged to the Roman state? nay, where was there almost any country or kingdom, but was within the compass and dominion of that empire? or, where was there any power or rule [as Luke uttereth it, πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην], either comparable to the power and rule of that state? or, indeed, where was there any power or rule, that was not now under it? The Roman stories, that describe the state of Rome at these times, do give an abundant account of her wealth, pomp, power, revenues, extent, and largeness, even to the amazement of the reader,—they were all so vast: and they do so commonly and familiarly call the Roman empire, ‘the empire of the whole world,’ that scarce any thing is more ordinary among them. Let but one be a taste of the rest; and let us take up all in little, in that prayer that Paterculus^t, a man that lived in these very times, makes in reference to Tiberius, who was emperor and lord of this vast pomp and power, at this very present, in the conclusion of his book: “Voto finiendum volumen sit. Jupiter Capitoline—Gravide Mars—Vesta—et quicquid Numinum hanc Romani Imperii molem in amplissimum terrarum orbis fastigium extulit,—destinate successores quam serissimos; sed eos, quorum cervices tam fortiter sustinendo terrarum orbis Imperio sufficient, quam hujus suffecisse sensimus.”

3. If Satan had claim and interest in any place, state, or pomp, under heaven, it was in Rome and her appurtenances: and if those words of his, which Luke hath added, “All this glory will I give thee, for that is delivered to me, and to whomsoever I will give it,” were true of any place, it was true of this. For, first, observe the characters and decipherings of Rome, as it is set out in Scripture, and see whether it carry not the very image and superscription of the dragon upon it. In Num. xxiv. 24, the first place that it is pointed out, it is doomed to eternal perdition; for both Jews, and even some Romanists themselves, understand Rome by ‘Chittim’ in that place. In Isa. xi. 4, it is called ‘The wicked one;’ as the Chaldee paraphrast there, and Paul [2 Thess. ii. 8], do expound it: “The abominable

^t Ed. Krause, p. 557.

armies," Dan. ix. 27 :—" The abomination of desolation," Matt. xxiv. 15 :—" The mother of fornications and abominations of the earth," Rev. xvii. 5, &c.—Secondly; Observe, that in it was met together all the cruelty, bloodiness, and persecution, that was in the four bestial monarchies, that were enemies to the church before Christ's first coming: Dan. vii, compared with Rev. xiii. And, thirdly, observe that this was the seat of Satan^v; and that he gave his power, and seat, and authority, to the beast of this city; that this was as his special heritage,—and his heir-apparent, 'the singular seed of the serpent,' antichrist, was to arise here. And lastly, observe, that the kingdom of Christ, and the opposite kingdom of antichrist, were both now beginning; and that now the serpent's head began to be in danger, according to the prophecy so long ago, Gen. iii. 15.

Now, after all these considerations, may the reader take up some such hints as these; and enlarge them in his own thoughts, according as he finds them fixing on his thoughts, and worthy meditation :—

1. How probable it is, that Satan, when he maketh this offer to our Saviour, doth intentionally point out this very antichristian city and her glory.

2. How much truer he speaketh, than he commonly doth, or is commonly observed to do, here, when he saith, that all power was delivered to him, and he might give it to whom he would.

3. How he doth offer to seat Christ in the very throne of antichrist, and would persuade the singular seed of the woman, to become the singular seed of the serpent, and his own heir placed by himself in his own seat.

4. How, by this cursed overture, he would have stopped and stifled the gospel in the very beginning and rise of it, by choking the great preacher of it, with all the power and pomp of the Roman state.

5. How, that he might prevent the breaking of his own head by the kingdom of Christ, he striketh at the very head of Christ, tempting him with the glory of the kingdom of antichrist; and would have him to do, as antichrist would do,—fall down and worship the dragon.

6. How Rome is laid by the devil for a stumbling-block.

^v Rev. xiii. 2.

in the way of the gospel, as soon as ever Christ appeareth towards the preaching of it.

7. How, when Satan cannot, at the entrance of the gospel, persuade Christ by all the pomp of Rome, to do like anti-christ,—he setteth up antichrist at Rome, to be an enemy to the gospel, in all the continuance of it.

8. Compare Christ's refusal here, with the Jews' choice hereafter, John xix. 13: here he is offered to be the Cæsar and lord of the Roman empire, which he refuseth; there he is refused, and Cæsar preferred before him.

Now, for the resolution of the second query, viz. after what manner Satan represented this object before him, these things may be considered:—

First, That it is not possible, that this was a real and a very representation of these things indeed; for divers things do contradict it. For, first, there is scarcely any mountain under heaven, from whence any one kingdom can be viewed over: and, if there were, there is scarcely any eye, under heaven, that could view it. And whereas the devil brought Christ into an exceeding high mountain, when he would show him this spectacle,—it was rather to colour the delusion, than to realize the prospect: for what he showed him from that mountain, and as he showed it him, he could have presented it as well upon any flat or valley. For,

Secondly, Matthew saith, that he showed him not only all the kingdoms of the world, but also the glory of them: now this clearly argues, that Satan presented something more than could be seen in a common prospect. For though it had been possible for any eye to have seen all the kingdoms of the world, that is, all the countries of them, as they lie,—yet would not that view and prospect show their pomp and glory. He that from Highgate vieweth London, seeth the city; but he that will behold the glory of London, must go into it.

And, thirdly, Luke addeth, that 'he showed him all these things in a moment of time:' by which very expression he seemeth to intimate, that here was something different from common prospecting or beholding: for men, looking upon a goodly prospect from a high place, view it successive, one part after another, and must turn themselves round; and if they will look farther than that place will suffer them, they must remove to another hill, where that prospect ter-

minates: but here all this vast object, of all the kingdoms of the earth, is presented at one view, in a moment of time.

2. Therefore, there was some juggling and delusion of the devil in this business, and he rather presented an object of his own framing, than the eyes of Christ took up the sight of these kingdoms, as they really were. And it is far more proper to conceive thus of this matter, than either to understand these kingdoms for ‘the spiritual kingdoms of sins,’ as some do, and to little sense,—or to think, that ‘his showing these earthly kingdoms and their glory, was but pointing out, where such a country and kingdom lay, and telling what wealth, pomp, and power, it was of,’ as it is interpreted by others. Nor is it any derogation to our Saviour at all, to conceive, that delusion was practised and proposed to him in this matter, any more than it was derogation to him, to be assaulted and used by the devil in the other temptations. For,

1. Though here had been ‘*deceptio visus*,’ and our Saviour’s eyes had taken and received this, as a real and a true object, which was but fictitious and fantastical,—it had but showed the truth of his human nature, and neither sin nor imperfection at all. For, 1. Error of sense, simply considered, is not sin. And, 2. Such a thing as this might have been done to Adam in innocency; seeing ‘*deceptio visus*,’ or error of any other sense, is ‘*consequens naturæ*,’ rather than ‘*fructus peccati* ;’ an invincible necessity in the finiteness of our nature, rather than any proper issue or fruit of sinfulness.

2. But our Saviour was so fully acquainted with the legerdemains of the devil, and with the course of natural things, as that he could not be thus deceived by shadows; but judged of this prospect according as it was indeed, airy, delusory, and fantastical, though the devil presented it to him under the notion of real.

3. Now the acting of Satan in this delusion, was, the framing an airy horizon before the eyes of Christ, carrying such pompous and glorious appearances of kingdoms, and states, and royalties, and riches, in the face of it, as if he had seen those very kingdoms, and their very state indeed. For this prince of the air doth most commonly work his delusions by that element, when he frameth them to the outward senses. And that expression, used by the apostle^w, “The

^w Ephes. ii. 2.

prince of the power of the air," is worth the looking after to this purpose. Κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, κατὰ τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ αἵρος, "In time past, ye walked according to the course of this world" ['Secundum sæculum mundi hujus,' doth the Vulgar and Erasmus render it, and it may be with reference to the world's age of heathenism], "according to the prince" [which the Syriac explaineth, 'as is the will of the prince'] "of the power of the air:" or, according to Beza, "Secundum principem, cui potestas est aeris." Now what is to be understood by 'the power of the air,' is of doubtful and various conjecture; whether to take it for 'darkness,' or for the power that the devil hath upon that element; or, which I rather conceive, for the 'principality of the air,' that is, for the devils; for, in that sense, the word ἐξουσία cometh so oft in Scripture, that it were needless to exemplify; yet see Luke iv. 6; Rom. xiii. 1, 2, &c. And, according to this construction, the phrase, 'the prince of the principality of the air,' is but the same with that in Mark iii. 22, 'the prince of devils:—and so the scope of the apostle should intend this, to make a gradation, or to heighten the conception, of the Ephesians' former impiety, by this aggravation,—that they walked not only according to the garb of the world, but according to the will of the very prince of devils; and κόσμος οὗτος, and ἐξουσία αἵρος, 'this world,' and the 'principality of the air,' to stand in antithesis one to another, for the visible world of men, and for the invisible world of devils; and αἰὼν and ἄρχων, to stand in the like opposition, for the rule and course of the one, and for the ruler and prince of the other. But be the sense of the expression which of these it will, it holdeth out the dominion and power that the devil hath in the air, and upon it,—which he exerciseth accordingly, sometimes in real and very sensible effects indeed, as in raising storms and tempests; and sometimes in delusive and fantastical apparitions, as in the thing in hand, and in the blood and frogs of Egypt, which the sorceries produced. Now, in the exhibition of such phantasms as these, he doth a threefold act at once,—namely, condensate the air, that it may become a visible object, shape it into such or such a figure, and colour it into such or such colour, that it may be an object of this or that representation: and this is no hard thing for the devil to do, considering the activity of his nature, as he is a spirit,—and his

readiness to act this activity, that he may deceive. In such a way as this did he deal in his false and delusive miracles in Egypt, in turning water into blood, and producing frogs: not that he did either really,—for it is impossible for any creature either to create forms, or to change forms; but his acting was upon the air, by colouring it over the waters, and by condensating it to the representing of frogs. And it is observable, that of those frogs, that Moses produced upon the land, it is said, “They died, and were gathered by the people on heaps, and stank^x;” for they were frogs indeed: but of those that were brought up by the magicians, there is no more mention; for they were but airy and fantastic apparitions.

§ “If thou wilt fall down, and worship me.”] Here is impudency come to its height, and the devil showing himself in his own colours indeed. Neither of the former temptations had so visibly and desperately invited Christ to impiety, as this doth, with open face: for in the first persuasion, ‘to turn stones into bread,’ there was some colour of Christ’s own benefit; for he was now hungry, and bread might have been a thing of welcomeness to him: and in the second, ‘to have flown in the air,’ there might be some colour of his honour and repute, in showing himself so miraculous before the people; as we read that some vain men have sought esteem by such a vain course,—as Icarus, mentioned by Suetonius^y; and Simon Magus, so reported of by all ecclesiastical historians; and both these not very many years after this time;—and Bladud, mentioned in our own stories, if he lived at any time at all. But to be invited in plain and downright terms, to fall down and worship the devil, hath no colour at all upon it but naked impiety. What! did not the devil know Christ who he was? that we have proved before, that he did;—or, did he think that Christ knew not who he was? that he could not think, if he knew Christ, as he did. What shall we say then to this damned overture of having Christ to adore him? why, here he joineth all his power of temptation together; and would, 1. bring Christ into a more low fall than he had done Adam; and, 2. makes a stroke desperately at him to have bruised his head, whereas it was told him he should bruise his heel only; and all this, because, being of an intolerable impudency, he would ob-

^x Exod. viii. 13, 14.

^y In the life of Nero, chap. 12. [By Icarus is meant he who personated Icarus.—ED.]

trude any thing, even beyond all sense, reason, and modesty, to compass his own design; and seeing Christ had condescended so far as to be hurried by him in the air, he would leave no way unattempted of tempting, if so it might have been possible to have corrupted innocency now, as he did once in Adam; and to have power over his mind, as he saw he had so far over his body. And thus hath he done his worst, and showed his devilship to the utmost, to have brought the second Adam to have been a sinner like the first; but here the seed of the woman, that was promised Adam, bruised the head of the serpent, who would have bruised his.

Ver. 10: "Get thee hence, Satan."] Luke's expressing of this hath bred some scruple; for he hath phrased it, *ὑπάγε ὀπίσω μου*, rendered by our English, "Get thee behind me, Satan;" being the very same words that our Saviour useth to Peter^z, when he would have persuaded him not to have been Christ, as the devil would here have persuaded him to be antichrist. Hence hath a doubting been bred with some, whether Christ commanded the devil clean away, any more than he did Peter; or only commanded him either to get behind his back, or not to offer to advise or direct him in any thing farther, as he had impudently done hitherto. The Syriac hath omitted that passage in Luke wholly, and so hath the Vulgar Latin; and Beza mentioneth four ancient Greek copies that wanted it also: "But (saith he) in the other, and in Theophylact, these words are found;" and so are they in the Arabic, and most authentic copies, expositions, and translations. Now the meaning of Christ in these words, is to pack Satan clean away from him indeed, as is apparent by the expression of Matthew, who saith only *ὑπάγε*, "be gone:" and by the sequel itself;—for Matthew telleth, that, upon these words, "the devil departed:" but Luke hath added the words *ὀπίσω μου*, "behind me," because he hath mentioned another temptation after this: and it would have seemed that Christ had not had command over the devil, if he had bidden, 'Be gone, Satan,'—and he had not departed. Therefore, though it were true indeed, that the devil did depart upon these words, and tempt Christ no more,—yet since it seemeth not so in Luke's method, therefore he used such an expression, as was suitable and agreeing to

^z Mark, viii. 33.

his own method and order; and which might both serve the same sense that Matthew intended in his expression, and yet withal save the sense of Luke himself, in regard of the ranking of these temptations. By the phrase, therefore, ‘Get thee behind me,’ he meaneth not, that Satan should only leave advising and instructing Christ what to do, and come behind him, as a disciple doth behind his master, yet following, and not departing from him: but by it he commandeth the devil never to offer to tempt and assault him in the like kind again; and curbeth his hideous impudency and sauciness, that durst thus assail him, &c. And to the same tenor may the same words of our Saviour to Peter, be readily and facilely understood, the intention of the temptation only differing.

Luke, iv. 13: “The devil departed from him, for a season.”] It is not so much material, to question, whether to render this ‘for a season’ [as our English, and some other translators do], or, ‘till a season’ [as the Syrian, Arabic, and some others, seem to do, and the word *ἄχρι* will very well bear]; as it is to inquire, when it was that the devil returned to assault Christ again, as this expression of the evangelist seemeth to enforce he did. But we shall take the consideration of all these together. The evangelist saith, first, That “the devil, having finished all the temptation, departed.” Now, this ending or finishing all the temptation, is understood by some to mean, that when he had proposed these temptations, he had proposed all manner of temptations whatsoever: and so he had, for he had tempted him to lust of the flesh, lust of the eye, and pride of life, which the apostle John makes the heads or generals of all the things that are in the world, 1 John, ii. 16; and he had tempted him visibly and invisibly, which are the two only ways of his temptations in his own person: but it may withal and rather be understood, that the devil, having now done his worst to have tempted him to sin, and not seeing himself prevail in it, he departed, resolving to assail him afterward in another way. It was told him in the garden, that he should bruise his heel; but here, if you observe him in all these his temptations, he strikes at his very head,—namely, to have brought Christ to have sinned, and so to have spoiled himself and redemption: but when he seeth that his endeavour in this hath been in vain, and that still he was far from bringing Christ to sin, but that Christ did foil him in every tempta-

tion, he will try no more at this time, nor to this purpose, nor in this way; but will reserve his farther enterprise till another time, end, and way of tempting. And the first of these the evangelist means, when he saith, He departed from him, ἄχρι καιροῦ: and, indeed, includeth the other two. The words ἄχρι καιροῦ, if we render them, ‘till a season’ [which is the most natural signification of them], may be taken in a double sense; either, ‘till a season opportune,’ or ‘till a season fixed.’ And I take the latter to be the most proper and very meaning of the words: for a more opportune season for his temptations than he had had already, Satan could not have wished; for he had had Christ alone; he had had him so, in the bitter inconveniences of hunger, cold, and watchfulness; and had had him so much in his power, as to carry him in the air from place to place; and yet, with all these advantages on his side, he could not have his will over him: and, therefore, there was no expecting any better convenience, or season, to bring him to sin, as he would have had him. But there was ‘a season fixed,’ when Satan must bruise his heel;—for God had so told him in the garden; and when he must have some power over him in something else, though he could have none over him to bring him to sinning: and, therefore, he departs now, unsped of what he came about, for he could not cause Christ to sin; but he will wait till that ‘fixed time’ come, when he is sure he shall speed against him some other way; and that was, when he caused his death. And to this very thing, Christ himself seemeth to allude, in those words^a, “The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me;” where almost every word, in a manner, faceth something in this story, that we have in hand. The phrase, ‘The prince of this world,’ answereth that offer, that Satan had made him, of giving him all the kingdoms of the world; “For they (saith he) are mine to give.” The word ‘cometh,’ answereth the words here, ‘departed till the season:’ and the words, ‘He hath nothing in me,’ meaneth, ‘his not being able to infuse any sin into Christ in any of these temptations, that he might thereby lay any claim to him.’ And this coming of this prince of the world, was to work his death; as is apparent by the very verse itself, and as our Saviour himself doth farther explain it^b, “This is the power of darkness.”

^a John, xiv. 30.

^b Luke, xxii. 53.

Satan's departure, therefore, from him at this time, when he had ended all the temptation, was, 1. With intent to assault him again, at the fixed season; when he knew he should have power over him to do him some hurt, though he could not now. 2. Then to bruise his heel, and to cause his death, though he could not now break his head, and cause him to sin. 3. To assault him then by his wicked instruments, whom he could not now damage by his wicked self. In one instrument [not properly his, but abused by him for such a purpose] he once tempted Christ to sin, before he assaulted him to bring him to suffer; and that was in the mouth of Peter^c, who received the very same check for his pains, "Get thee behind me, Satan," that Satan himself did for his last temptation.

Matt. iv. 11: "And, behold! angels came, and ministered unto him."] Mark hath told the story of the temptation very short: "He was there in the wilderness, forty days, tempted of Satan, and was with the wild beasts; and the angels ministered unto him." In which relation, as he hath given us account of his temptation, which showed him man,—so hath he also of two other things, which showed him more: and those were, his safety among wild beasts, and his visible attendance by angels. Now, he mentioneth only his forty days' temptation, which was by Satan invisibly,—and speaketh not a word of the three temptations, when Satan assailed him in a bodily shape,—and yet he saith, that the angels ministered unto him: which if you will strictly construe according to the very letter of his relation, you must conclude, that this ministration of angels was before Satan appeared visibly to him: and so it will follow, that the angels ministered to him visibly, and Satan tempted him invisibly, at the same time. But since the briefness of one evangelist is to be cleared by the larger relation of the other, we are to understand Mark by the fuller story of Matthew: and so, as Matthew doth show you the full history of the temptation, and teacheth you how to construe Mark's briefness upon it,—so must he also explain the time of the angels' ministration,—namely, after all the temptation was ended; which Mark hath left undetermined.

It were no very great solecism in divinity, to hold, that the angels might be visibly attending of Christ all those

^c Mark, viii. 32.

forty days, that the devil was invisibly tempting him: but since it is most probable, that Christ exposed himself in the nakedest manner, I mean, in the greatest plainness and meanness that might be, to Satan's tempting, that so his victory over him might be the more glorious,—it is also very probable, that he called not for such attendance of angels, but suspended it till his combat was done and the victory obtained. And then [howsoever they did before] “The angels came (saith Matthew) and ministered unto him.”

When the Scripture speaketh of spirits' or angels' coming or going, it doth most generally mean it of a visible and apparent manner, as Gen. xix. 1, and xxxii. 1, 2; Jude 6. 11; and in very many other places,—and so is it to be understood here: that after the evil angel, or the prince of the evil spirits, was departed, who had assailed Christ in a visible shape,—the good angels, in visible appearances also, came and gave their attendance on him. Their ministering unto him, as to particulars, was in bringing to him necessaries and provisions in that his hunger, and in that place, where, it is likely, provisions were not otherwise suddenly to be had: so the Son of man eateth angels' food, and, like Elias, is fed by the angels of the Lord in a desert place.

And thus hath Christ been showed the Son of God by the voice of the Father, and anointed for the great King, Priest, and Prophet, visibly, by the Holy Ghost. And thus hath he showed his power and command over the evil angels; and the good angels have owned his lordship and dominion over themselves; and thus, every way attested, is he presently to appear amongst men, as the minister of the gospel.

SECTION XII.

JOHN, I.

Ver. 15. JOHN bare witness [*a*] of him, and cried, saying, ‘This was [*b*] he of whom I spake,—He that cometh after me [*c*] is preferred before me: for he was before me.’

16. And of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace.

17. For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.

18. No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, which is in [*d*] the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.

19. And this is the record of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, ‘Who art thou [e]?’

20. And he confessed, and denied not [f]; but confessed, ‘I am not the Christ.’

21. And they asked him, ‘What then? Art thou Elias?’ And he saith, ‘I am not [g].’—‘Art thou that prophet?’ And he answered, ‘No.’

22. Then said they unto him, ‘Who art thou? that we may give an answer to them that sent us: what sayest thou of thyself?’

23. He said, ‘I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness,—Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Esaias.’

24. And they which were sent, were of the Pharisees.

25. And they asked him, and said unto him, ‘Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet?’

26. John answered them, saying, ‘I baptize with water; but there standeth [h] one among you, whom ye know not;

27. He it is, who, coming after me, is preferred before me, whose shoes’ latchet I am not worthy to unloose.’

28. These things were done in Bethabara [i] beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing.

29. The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, ‘Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins [k] of the world [l].’

30. This is he of whom I said,—After me cometh a man which is preferred before me: for he was before me.

31. And I knew him not: but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water.’

32. And John bare record, saying, ‘I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him.

33. And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me,—Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.

34. And I saw and bare record, that this is the Son of God.’

35. Again the next day after, John stood, and two of his disciples;

36. And looking upon Jesus as he walked, he saith, 'Behold the Lamb of God!'

37. And the two disciples heard him speak, and they followed Jesus.

38. Then Jesus turned, and saw them following, and saith unto them, 'What seek ye?' They said unto him, 'Rabbi [*m*] (which is to say, being interpreted, 'Master'), where dwellest thou?'

39. He saith unto them, 'Come and see.' They came and saw where he dwelt, and abode with him that day: for it was about the tenth hour.

40. One of the two which heard John speak, and followed him, was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother.

41. He first findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him, 'We have found the Messias;' which is, being interpreted, the Christ [*n*].

42. And he brought him to Jesus. And when Jesus beheld him, he said, 'Thou art Simon the son of Jona: thou shalt be called Cephas;' which is, by interpretation, Peter.

43. The day following, Jesus would go forth into Galilee, and findeth Philip; and saith unto him, 'Follow me.'

44. Now Philip was of Bethsaida, the city of Andrew and Peter.

45. Philip findeth Nathanael [*o*], and saith unto him, 'We have found him, of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph.'

46. And Nathanael said unto him, 'Can there any good come out of Nazareth?' Philip saith unto him, 'Come and see [*p*].'

47. Jesus saw Nathanael coming to him, and saith of him, 'Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile.'

48. Nathanael saith unto him, 'Whence knowest thou me?' Jesus answered and said unto him, 'Before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig-tree, I saw thee.'

49. Nathanael answereth, and saith unto him, 'Rabbi, thou art the Son of God: thou art the King of Israel.'

50. Jesus answered and said unto him, 'Because I said unto thee,—I saw thee under the fig-tree, believest thou? Thou shalt see greater things than these.'

51. And he saith unto him, 'Verily, verily [*q*], I say unto you, Hereafter you shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man.'

[a] In the Greek it is, John ‘beareth witness,’ and ‘cried,’ μαρτυρεῖ καὶ κέκραγε, the former word in the present tense, and the latter in the preter tense; the tenses being either indifferently put one for another, as the translator of Cyril hath rendered them, “Testatur, et clamat;” or “Nove hoc” (as Erasmus phraseth it); this strange construction is used by the evangelists, to show, in the former word, μαρτυρεῖ, the continuance of John’s testimony,—and, in the latter word, κέκραγε, the openness, clearness, vigour, and powerfulness, of it: so Chemnitius, Grotius, Beza, &c. Change of tenses, indeed, is no strange thing in Scripture language; as John iv. 28, ἀπῆλθε καὶ λέγει, “she departed, and saith,” &c; yet this alteration seemeth to carry something more with it, than merely change of tense, without difference of construction; especially, if the sense and scope of the whole verse be considered and taken up together, which shall be done hereafter in the explanation of it.

[b] Beza conceiveth here, that ἦν is put for ἐστὶ, *was* for *is*; for he saith, ‘he can see no reason, why the preterimperfect tense is used in this place:’—but, on the other hand, I see as little reason, why John, if he meant to say here, “this is he,” should not say, οὗτός ἐστι here, as well as he doth in ver. 27, and ver. 30: and I suppose it will be very hard to give a reason, why in the one place he should say οὗτος ἦν, and in the other οὗτός ἐστι, if he meant the same thing. But this also shall be taken into explanation afterward.

[c] Or, ‘that is to come after me;’ as ὁ ἐρχόμενος signifieth, Rev. i. 8.

[d] Εἰς doth often carry the sense of ἐν, as Matt. ii. 23; Luke i. 20; Acts vii. 4, viii. 23: and so may εἰς ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης, Rom. viii. 21, be best interpreted, in the sense of ἐν ἐλευθερίᾳ, “Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God;” the preposition ἐν, or *in*, denoting the time; as, ἐν κλάσει ἄρτου, “As he was breaking bread,” Luke xxiv. 35.

The phrase, “in the bosom,” see Num. xi. 12; Deut. xiii. 6.

[e] It is more than probable, that they that ask him this question, did know who John was both by birth and name: and, therefore, their query, ‘Who art thou,’ is proposed to him in regard of his function, rather than in regard of his

person; and meaneth rather, 'what kind of minister art thou,' than, 'what man art thou?' So Ruth iii. 16, מִי אַתְּ בִּתִּי 'Quænam tu, filia mea?' 'Who art thou, my daughter?' that is, 'Quo statu tu,' or, 'How is it with thee?'—So 1 Sam. xvii. 55, בֶּן מִי זֶה 'whose son is this?' Not 'filius cujus,' but 'filius qualis viri hic,' 'what kind of man's son is this?' as is noted there.

[f] It is a common elegancy of the Scripture, to use an affirmative and a negative together, to make out the same sense; sometimes the negative first, as Psal. cxviii. 17, "I shall not die, but live," &c: sometimes the affirmative first, as Isa. xxxviii. 1, "Thou shalt die, and not live:"—but a negative between two affirmatives, as here, is for the greater emphasis and expression.

[g] "I am not."] His answer is to their question in their sense: for, although John were that Elias that was prophesied of to come, Mal. iv. 5, as our Saviour doth clearly expound it, Matt. xi. 14; and the angel doth tell how it is to be understood, Luke i. 17,—yet was he far from being that Elias that the Jews looked for, and in their sense; as see hereafter. The Scripture doth sometimes title things, not as they be really in themselves, but as they be in men's apprehensions, or to men's purposes: as when the apostle calleth preaching 'foolishness,' 1 Cor. i. 21; and when the Holy Ghost calleth Ahithophel's counsel 'good,' 2 Sam. xvii. 14, &c. And so John giveth his answer here according to the apprehensions of those, that ask him the question concerning Elias.

[h] The Syriac readeth it in the present tense, as doth our English; and so doth Beza and divers others; and so, indeed, might the Greek word very well bear it: but since it is said, "John saw Jesus coming the next day," it is an argument, that he was not present there now; and, therefore, it is most properly to be read in the time past, "there *hath stood* one among you."

[i] The Syriac, Arabic, Vulgate, Cyril, and divers others, read it not 'Bethabara,' but 'Bethania;' conceiving, belike, this place to be Ænon, in chap. iii. 24, with the word 'Beth' put before it; which is most common in the Hebrew tongue, with names of places. For בֶּתַח and בֶּתַנּי are of so near affinity in the root, and of not so far difference in the sound, that it is possible they may be confounded one with another; and it is probable they were so in these men's opinions. But

the uncontrollable warrant of authentic copies of antiquity doth read it ‘Bethabara;’ and even reason itself telleth, that it ought not to be read ‘Bethania.’ For, first, The Scripture never mentioneth any Bethania near Jordan at all; for the Bethania that it speaketh of, is many miles distant from Jordan. And, secondly, That Ænon and Bethania were not the same, we shall see elsewhere.

[*k*] In the Greek it is *sin*, in the singular number: which hath caused some to understand it of original sin only; not minding, it seemeth, the common custom of the Scripture to put one number for another; especially by the word *sin*, in the singular number, to understand all sins whatsoever.

[*l*] Here is no ground at all for universal redemption; for the word *world*, standeth here in opposition to the Jews, as this very evangelist himself explaineth it, 1 John ii. 2; “And he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only” (of the Jewish nation), “but also for the sins of the whole world;” and of men of other nations; and so he meaneth here,—that ‘Christ is the Lamb of God, a sacrifice, not for the Jews only, but for the Gentiles, and other nations also.’

[*m*] “Rabbi.”] This and other titles of their doctors, as Rab, and Rabban, and Rabbi, were but lately grown into use and request among them, and sprang up but very little before the birth of Christ. The prophets, and the men of the great synagogue, and all the generations till the times of Hillel, had been content with their bare proper names; as Sadoc, Baithus, Antigonus, Shammai, Hillel, Shemaia, Abtalion, and the like, very frequent and common in mention in the Jewish authors. But Simeon, the son of Hillel (he that took our Saviour in his arms, Luke ii), was the first doctor among them ‘cum titulo,’ and he was called “Rabban.” From his times and forward, titles came exceedingly into request and fashion among them; and none more common than the title Rabbi, as appeareth frequently in the gospel, and infinitely in their own writers. Now, the reason why in these times, and not before, this titularity grew into use and custom so much among them, may be guessed to be either one or both these two: 1. Because of the contestation that had been continually between the schools of Shammai and Hillel, they commonly differing in opinion and judgment in every thing almost that came before them (like Scotists and Thomists), and very seldom, or never, having the luck to con-

cur and consent in any opinion: whereupon the scholars of either took titles upon them, that they might, as it were, by their high-swoln epithets, out-swagger one another. 2. Because their learning, as they supposed (at least their pride), was come to its very apex, or perfection: that passage in the Talmud, concerning the scholars of Hillel, makes it seem no wonder, if they from those times forward did swell into titles: "Hillel (saith the Talmud) had eighty scholars; thirty of them were fit, that the divine glory should rest upon them, as it did upon Moses; thirty others were worthy, that the sun should stand still for them, as it did for Joshua; and twenty were of a form between," &c. It was with the Jews now, as it proved afterward among the Christian doctors; who, when piety, truth, and humility, reigned among them, were content with their bare names,—as Austin, Ambrose, Jerome, &c; but when pride and error were got aloft, then the titles of 'Divus,' 'Seraphicus,' 'Angelicus,' and the like, came into fashion and entertainment.

These Jewish titles imported, 'Mastership,' 'Doctorship,' or 'Principality;' and were of higher dignity one than another: גדול מרב רבי וגדול מרב רבן Aruch in אב: "Rabbi was a more excellent title than Rab; and Rabban more excellent than Rabbi." Rab was the more proper title of the Babylonian doctors; Rabbi, of the Judean; and Rabban, ascribed to seven men only.

[n] "Which is, being interpreted, Christ."] These are the words of the evangelist, the historian, and not the words of Andrew: for it was needless for him to tell Peter, what was the meaning of Messiah; and, accordingly, the Syriac translator hath omitted this clause: and that in ver. 42, "which is, by interpretation, Peter;" and that also, chap. iv. 25, "which is, by interpretation, Christ;" as knowing it unnecessary to tell a Hebrew, or a Syrian, what is meant by Messiah, or Cephas.

[o] We find the name Nathanael in the Old Testament also; as, 1 Chron. xv. 24, Ezra x. 22, &c. But Philip, and Andrew, and Nicodemus, &c. were names of a latter edition, taken up into use, since the Grecian power and language had overspread Judea, and those eastern countries. This Nathanael was of Cana of Galilee, John xxi. 2; one of the first disciples called, and that continued with Jesus to the very last, as it appeareth by that place in John. Now since

all these, that are mentioned in this chapter by name, as Peter, and Andrew, and Philip, were made apostles, it is somewhat strange if Nathanael missed the like place.

[*p*] “Come and see.”] A very common phrase among Jewish writers; *תא דא* in the Talmud language; and *בוא וראה* in the common Hebrew. They use it, when they are about to produce any demonstration, or to declare a matter: and sometime, instead of it, they use *תא שמע* ‘come and hear,’—and *בוא ולמוד* ‘come and learn:’ as see Tanch. fol. 1. col. 2; and fol. 57. col. 1.

[*q*] “Verily, verily.”] Greek, *Ἀμὴν, ἀμὴν*. This phrase shall be opened in the explication of the verse: here let the reader only observe some peculiar use of the word ‘Amen’ among the Jews: “The judges adjured a man, saying, We adjure thee by the Lord God of Israel, or by him whose name is Merciful, that thou hast nothing of this man’s in thy hand; and he answered, Amen. Or they said, N, the son of N, is cursed of the Lord God of Israel, or of him whose name is Merciful, if such a man’s goods be in his hand, and he discover it not; and he answered, Amen:” Maimon. tract. Shevugnoth. ver. 11. And so he relateth concerning vows, that “whosoever vowed any holy thing, and bound it up with Amen, he was tied,” &c. Vid. Sam. Petit. Variarum Lect. lib. 1. cap. 7; who concludeth here-upon thus, “Cum dicit Christus, *Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν*, idem est ac si diceret, Juratus vobis dico.”

Reason of the Order.

The evangelist John, of all the Four, hath only given us an account of what passed from John the Baptist either in doctrine or action, from the time of Christ’s baptizing, till John’s imprisonment; yea (set the temptation aside), there is none of the Four but he, that hath told us any passage concerning Christ himself in all that space. For the very next thing that Matthew and Mark relate, after they have done with the story of the temptation, is about John’s imprisoning; Matt. iv. 11, 12; Mark i. 13, 14. And Luke, though he express not that particular thing in clear terms, yet doth he, in the very next story after the temptation, speak of passages, that were not done till after that time; as will be seen in their due place. There is, therefore, in all the three, a general silence of any actions of our Saviour’s,

for the space of above a whole twelvemonth together,—namely, from about the middle of our November, when the temptation was ended, till about the latter end of November come twelvemonth, when Jesus, upon the report of John's imprisonment, departs into Galilee; as we shall take up the time more particularly, when we come to John iv. 35. Now, why the three evangelists should be so unanimously silent in so great a matter, for so long a time, needs not be questioned, since the Holy Ghost hath provided, that, by a fourth, that should be supplied what they had omitted. The evangelist John, therefore, doth, in this section, and from henceforward to the end of the fourth chapter, give us the story of John the Baptist, and of our Saviour, from the time of our Saviour's being baptized by him, till his arrival in Galilee, after John's imprisonment. And whereas the other three had only mentioned the actions of John, and his testimony of Christ before his baptism, this evangelist doth, in this section, give us account of more actions of, and more testimonies concerning, Christ after. Therefore, it needeth not to breed any scruple to any intelligent reader, to see, in this chapter, Peter and Andrew following Jesus before he call them, and that even while the Baptist is at liberty;—and to see, in Matt. iv, and Luke iv, Peter and Andrew called, before they follow Jesus, and the Baptist then shut up in prison: I say, it needs not to breed any scruple; since these are relations of two several stories, done and acted at a great distance of time; that, in this chapter, but a little while after Christ was baptized,—and that, in Matt. iv, a whole twelvemonth after.

Now this section that is before us, consisteth of several stories; and for the clearing and demonstrating of their proper order, it will be requisite to show the subsequence of them one to another, and the subsequence of them all to the temptation of Christ, which was treated of in the section before. For the evidencing of which, let it but be first observed, that all these passages, here mentioned, came to pass after Christ was baptized, as was said before, and as it is apparent, ver. 15. 32. 34: and then, to cast the whole section, or at least the beginning of it, into an historical paraphrase, will best show the order.

As soon, therefore, as Christ was baptized, and the Spirit was visibly come down upon him, “immediately” (as Mark

expresseth it) the same Spirit driveth him, or catcheth him, away from Jordan, in some visible rapture, towards the wilderness: so that those that were present, could see it, as it is most probable, and take notice of it, at the very instant and moment of his taking away, though they had not observed or taken notice of him before, nor saw him again at that time any more. And such a sudden rapture, and invisible impulsion of the Spirit, seemeth to have given occasion to John the Baptist, to cry out with vehemency, "This was he of whom I spake:" for it seemeth by those words, that Christ had been there with that company, to whom John speaketh,—but was not present at this time, when he speaketh to them: for had he been present, it had been more proper to have said, *This is he*, than, *This was*. And had there not been some visible demonstration and pointing out of Christ, in the sight, and to the knowledge, of the people, they had been never the wiser to understand, who it should be that John meant by the word *this*; but when all the people present had seen one of the company rapt and taken away suddenly, by a visible catching of the Spirit, from the midst of them, and then heard John to cry out, "This was he, of whom I spake," all their thoughts would readily fix upon the proper object, whom John intended; and they would understand then, that that was the Messiah, though they had not known, nor minded him, whilst he was amongst them. And this seemeth to me to be the proper reason, why the evangelist useth the preterimperfect tense (which Beza could see no reason, why he should),—because he speaketh of Christ, which had been with John at Jordan, and was but newly gone out of his sight. So that the first verse of this section, according to this construction, doth properly come in its order, in the time between Christ's baptizing, and his getting into the wilderness: and, accordingly, it might have been laid after the very first verse of the last section, and there have made this series of the story; "And immediately after the baptism of Jesus, the Spirit driveth him into the wilderness; and when he was rapt away, and but newly out of sight, John bare witness, and cried, saying, This was he of whom I spake:"—but I was unwilling to part that story, which lieth so joined, and it is timely enough to give notice of the order in this place.

Now the next story in this section, of the discourse be-

twixt the messengers of the Jews and John, they questioning who he was, and why he meant to baptize,—it was just in the time, while Christ was under the last temptation, or as he was returning from the high mountain, wheresoever it was, to Jordan again: for the text telleth expressly, that, on the next day after this dispute, Jesus appeareth at Jordan in the sight of John, ver. 29; and from thenceforward the connexion of the stories following is so clear, ver. 35, and 43, that it needeth no farther demonstration.

HARMONY AND EXPLANATION.

Ver. 15: “John bare witness of him, and cried,” &c.] The evangelist, from the beginning of the chapter to this place, and in it, doth purposely go about to show, what declarations and demonstrations were given of Christ, both before his coming in the flesh and after: what before, we showed in their proper place upon the chapter to the fourteenth verse; what after, is showed in this verse, and the next that follows. In the fourteenth verse, he tells, that Christ declared himself to be the only begotten of the Father, by conversing among his disciples, ‘full of grace and truth:’ and in this verse he showeth, how John declared and published him to all that came to be baptized,—and, in the next verse, how his disciples received of his fulness, &c.

Now, John’s manner of testimony of him, he expreseth by these two words, “He beareth witness, and cried;” words of different tenses, as was observed before, and of some difference of sense in that diversity.

The word *μαρτυρεῖ*, of the present tense, is properly to be understood, 1. Of John’s whole ministry, function, and office; as ver. 7 explaineth it, “He came for a witness:” not to be restrained to this or that particular vocal and verbal testimony, that John gave of Christ,—no, nor to all the vocal testimonies that he gave of Christ,—but to be dilated to John’s whole course and ministry, that he beareth witness to Christ, in that God raised up such a one to be his forerunner. And the word *κέκραγε* in the preter tense, is to be applied to the particular testimony that John gave of Christ in that his ministry. So that the former word referreth to John’s person, and his whole function; and the latter, only to the manner of his executing of one particular of that function.

2. The word *μαρτυρεῖ* may also include John's martyrdom for the truth, by which he beareth witness unto Christ even unto this time ; as, "Abel being dead, yet speaketh," Heb. xi. 4. And in this sense should I understand those words of this same evangelist in his First Epistle, chap. v. 6. 8 ; "Jesus Christ came by water and blood ; and the Spirit beareth witness. And there are three that bear witness in earth,—the spirit, and the water, and blood ;" that is, the spirit of prophecy, baptism, and martyrdom : all three agreeing in one testimony of Christ, that he is he ; the prophets speaking so jointly of him,—baptism bringing in so many unto him,—and martyrs sealing unto him with their dearest blood:—the scores that have prophesied of him, the thousands that have suffered death for him, and the many thousands that have been baptized into him,—bearing witness of him on earth, as the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, do in heaven.

§ "He that cometh after me, is preferred before me."] We do not find, that John had, at any time before Christ's baptism, given any such testimony as these words. He had said, indeed, "A mightier than I cometh after me, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear, and whose shoes' latchet I am not worthy to unloose," as the other three evangelists agree in the relating of it ; but these words, "He is preferred before me, for he was before me," we heard not of till now. Yet is it to be conceived, that the Baptist speaketh to the same sense now, that he did before ; as ver. 27 sheweth his intention, though he have altered his expressions. For it is a very common custom of Scripture, in alleging of former speeches, to give the sense, but not to keep exactly to the words. And yet it is not without its weight, that, whereas John's constant testimony of Christ before his baptism, was, "A mightier than I cometh,"—he should as constantly, after his baptism, use this, "He, coming after me, is preferred before me ;" as here, and ver. 27. 30.

Now the reason of this seemeth to be, because Christ had now appeared, and no mighty work had been yet showed among the people by him ; no, nor any thing done in their eyes or hearing, which might give them occasion to conceive, that he was mightier or stronger than John. The appearance of the Holy Ghost, and the voice from heaven, they had neither seen nor heard : only his catching away

from Jordan at this time, it is probable they saw; therefore, John, to clear their apprehensions from any carnal misconstruction of his words, explains himself,—that by ἰσχυρότερός μου, “A mightier than I,” they were not so to understand, as to look for any present visible demonstration of power or miraculousness from him,—but that they should take notice, that he, of whom he spake those words, was before him in rank and dignity; for he was before him in time and office, nature and qualifications, though he came after him.

§ “Is preferred before me.”] Ἐμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν: which the Vulgar Latin hath dangerously translated, “Ante me factus est,” “he was made before me;” and, accordingly, the Arians, in ancient time, made use of this place in this sense, against the eternity of the Son. Whereas the word ἔμπροσθεν (as Beza well observeth it), in the New Testament, doth constantly refer to place, and not to time, as Mark i. 2; Matt. xvii. 2; Luke xii. 8; and xix. 27, 28; and divers other places; and, therefore, our English hath well expressed it with an intimation of such a thing,—is *preferred* before me. For ἔμπροσθέν μου and πρῶτός μου, in this speech of the Baptist, must needs have a distinct and different sense; because the word ὅτι, between them, doth show, that the one is made the reason of the other; ‘He was before me in place and pre-eminence, because he was before me in time and being.’ Now the word γέγονε, which seemeth to refer to the time past (and which hath occasioned ἔμπροσθεν by some to be understood concerning priority of time), is to be construed in such a construction, as the word ἐγενήθη is in Matt. xxi. 42, and γενόμενος, Acts iv. 11; words not of the present tense, and yet necessarily to be rendered in the present time, “I *become* the head of the corner.”

Ver. 16: “And of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace.”] I. These are the words of the evangelist, and not of the Baptist; and so they are held to be by Cyril, Chrysostom, Chemnitius, and some others; though there be, that hold that they are the Baptist’s words; and some, that think no matter whether’s words they be taken to be, either the one, or the other.

They appear to be spoken by the evangelist: 1. By their agreement with his words in ver. 14; for there he speaketh of “Christ’s being full of grace and truth,”—and here, of their enjoying of his fulness. 2. By the agreement of the

next following verse, which, no question, proceeded from the same speaker, with ver. 14, also. 3. By the agreement of ver. 18, which as doubtless proceeded from the same speaker likewise, with the same words of the same evangelist, 1 John iv. 12. 4. Those that the Baptist was speaking to in the verse preceding, were as yet altogether ignorant of Christ, and unacquainted with his appearing; and, therefore, it was most improper for John to say of himself, and of them together, ‘All we have received,’ when they had yet received little or nothing at all. 5. The very sense of the words will demonstrate them to be the speech of the evangelist, and not of the Baptist; as will appear in taking them up.

II. The verse consisteth of two several and distinct clauses, and the word *and* in the middle of it, though it be a conjunctive particle, yet plainly forceth this distinction; for though it is not to be denied, that *καὶ ἐξηγητικὸν*, are very frequent in Scripture, that is, the word *and* very oft bringing on a latter clause, which speaketh but the very same thing, though in plainer terms, with the former, and in explanation of it,—yet is this here unlikely to be such a one, though held by divers so to be: for I suppose it will be very hard to match or parallel this verse in all the Scripture, with a *καὶ* that is of such a tenor. The verse, therefore, being thus two distinct and several clauses, it is, inevitably and necessarily, to be construed in such a kind of syntax and construction; “Of his fulness we have received somewhat: and we have also received grace for grace.” And this was well observed by Austin long ago, “He saith not (saith he), Of his fulness we have received grace for grace; but, ‘Of his fulness we have all received, and grace for grace;’ so that he would have us to understand, that we have received somewhat of his fulness, and grace over and above.”

III. Although it be most true, that all the saints of God have received all their graces of the fulness of Christ, for so Chrysostom and Cyril understand and interpret the word *we*;—and though it be as true, that the holy patriarchs and prophets, that were before John, received all their gifts and endowments from the same fulness; for so some others interpret that word *we*, as if John should mean them, and join himself with them, when he saith, “We have all received;”

—yet it seemeth, that the meaning and intention of the evangelist in this place, is neither the one nor the other; but that, by the word *we*, in this place, he understandeth himself only and his fellow-disciples. For, 1. He had used the word in that sense, ver. 14, “he dwelt among *us*, and *we* saw his glory;” where the words *us* and *we* do necessarily signify the apostles or disciples only, as was showed there; and how can the same word *we* be taken in this verse, which is but two verses off, any way so properly as in the same sense as it was there? 2. The evangelist is, in this place, showing how Christ was declared and published by his ministers, as well as he showed himself in his own person. ‘And as John the Baptist was the first, so *we*, the apostles and disciples, were next appointed to be preachers and proclaimers of him;’ as we shall see by the scope of these verses, that lie together, by and by.

IV. Now, that the apostles received exceeding much from, or of, Christ’s fulness, there needeth no proving to those, that have read the gospel: they received of that, exceeding much favour, exceeding much sanctification, exceeding much knowledge, exceeding much miraculous power, exceeding much of the Spirit, and, over and beside all this, they received ‘grace for grace.’

V. This latter clause hath almost as many several interpretations given of it, as there be words in the whole verse; I shall not spare to present the reader with the variety, because I will not deny him his choice.

Austin, in the place lately alleged, paraphraseth it thus; “We received of his fulness, first grace, and then again we received grace for grace. What grace received we first? faith; walking in faith, we walk in grace. What meaneth grace for grace? By faith, we obtain^d God, justification, and life eternal.”

Chrysostom, in Homil. 14, on John, gives it thus;—“Grace for grace: which for which? the new for the old; for as there is a righteousness^e and a righteousness, a faith and a faith, adoption and adoption, a glory and a glory, a law and a law, a worship and a worship, a covenant and a covenant, a sanctifying and a sanctifying, a baptism and a baptism, sacrifice and sacrifice, temple and temple, circumcision and circumcision,—so is there a grace and a grace;

^d Promeremur.

^e Phil. iii. 6. Rom. i. 17. 2 Cor. iii. 9. Rom. viii. 4.

but they as types, these as the truth.” And much in the same tract goeth Cyril^f, comparing the evangelical grace given by Christ, with the legal grace under Moses: and of the same judgment is Beza.

Tolet, on this place, glosseth it thus; “ Grace is given to us, because of the grace, that is in Christ; and we are made acceptable to God, because of him:”—or, as Camera-rius, that embraceth the same sense, doth express it; “ We have received the favour towards us, because of the favour of God towards the Son.” Maldonat saith; “ ‘ Grace for grace’ is, that some have received one grace, some another.” Ludovicus De Dieu taketh it, “ One grace because of another; the latter because of the former; the first grace, is the cause of the second,—and the second, of a third,—and so on.” Some take for “ one grace upon another,” or graces multiplied. Others, for “ grace in us agreeable to the grace in Christ,” the like in kind, though not in degree. And, for conclusion, there is that supposeth, that “ grace for grace,” meaneth only grace freely bestowed, and ἀντὶ χάριτος doth only interpret the Hebrew word חנם or ‘ gratis.’

All which interpretations, are, indeed, true, in regard of the matter contained in them,—yet, whether they are pregnant expositions of this place, the scope of the place, and the intention of the evangelist in it, may give occasion to doubt and scruple. For the evangelist is, apparently, hitherto and here speaking, of manifold declarations, that were of Christ,—or of the several ways and means, by which he was revealed, as hath been observed: and, therefore, it is the surest way, to interpret these words, suitable to that scope and intention. And, accordingly, I cannot but apprehend, and render these words so, as that the word ‘ grace,’ in the first place, should signify the ‘ grace of apostleship,’—and ‘ grace’ in the latter place, mean ‘ grace in the hearts of the hearers;’ and the word ἀντὶ, or *for*, should denote the final cause: which construction, being taken up in this paraphrase, will more easily be understood:—“ And of his fulness, all we his disciples have received exceeding full and eminent gifts: and withal, we have received the grace of apostleship for the doctrine of the free grace of God, and for the propagating of grace in the hearts of others:” and, as the scope of the evangelist draweth the verse unto such a sense, so doth

^f Lib. 2. on John, cap. 21.

the force and virtue of the language justify it. For, first, the word *χάρις* is sometime in Scripture, applied to such a construction, as we put upon it in the first part of the clause, as Rom. i. 5; *Ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολὴν*, “We have received grace” (the very word used here) “and apostleship;” which Beza well glosseth, “*Gratiam et apostolatum, id est, gratiam apostolatus;*” that is, “the grace of apostleship:” “*Beneficium eximiæ plane liberalitatis, quod alibi vocat^r, χάρισμα.*” And in the same sense the apostle speaking, 1 Cor. xv. 9, “I am the least of the apostles, which am not worthy to be called an apostle,” addeth, *χάριτι δὲ Θεοῦ εἰμι ὃ εἰμι, καὶ ἡ χάρις αὐτοῦ ἡ εἰς ἐμὲ, &c.* “But by the grace of God, I am what I am; and his grace on me was not in vain,” &c.

Secondly; The preposition *ἀντὶ* doth, sometimes, and very properly, denote the end and intention of a thing, and hath regard to the final cause; as 1 Cor. xi. 15, “Hair is given to a woman,” *ἀντὶ περιβολαίου*, “that it may be a covering:”—Heb. xii. 2, *ἀντὶ χαρᾶς προκειμένης*, “Because of the joy that lay before him:”—Matt. xx. 28, *Λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν*, “A redemption in behalf of many,” &c. And so among profane authors, it is not seldom used in the sense of ‘*Gratia,*’ or ‘for the sake,’ as *ἀνθ’ ὅτου*, ‘*cujus gratia;*’ *ἀντὶ μηδένος*, ‘*non nullius gratia;*’ *ἀντὶ τούτου τοῦ διδάγματος*, ‘*hujus doctrinæ gratia,*’ &c. And so may it very fitly be interpreted in this place, “We received grace because of, or for the sake of, grace, or, in behalf of grace;” that is, that it may be advanced in the thoughts, and propagated, and wrought in the hearts of others.

Ver. 17: “For the law was given by Moses,” &c.] He had, in the verses preceding, treated concerning the declaration of Christ before his coming, and after it; both in the law, and under the gospel: and in the three last verses before, he had handled this latter head; viz. how he was declared in the gospel after his coming.

1. In his own person and converse, ver. 14; “The Word became flesh, and dwelt in us, full of grace and truth; and we saw his glory,” &c.

2. In the ministry of John the Baptist, ver. 15; “John bare witness of him, and cried, saying,” &c.

3. In the ministry of the apostles, ver. 16; “Of his fullness we have all received,” &c.

And now he cometh to weigh the tenor of the law, and of the gospel; in both which Christ was thus declared; and to compare them together, and the two persons that were the chief ministers in the exhibition of them, Christ and Moses: the two persons, in regard of their ministry of the doctrine of salvation; and the two things, in regard of their tenor, clearness, and exhibition, of that doctrine.

The word *for*, in the beginning of the verse, joineth this verse, and that that went before, together; and it pieceth either to the whole verse, to make up this sense,—“We received the grace of apostleship, for the preaching of the gospel, as Moses did the law;” or rather, to the last word *grace*, to the result of this sense; “We received apostleship for the propagation and advancement of grace, whereas Moses gave the law for the advancement of works:”—for so the opposition, that is in this verse, doth hold it out; as may be observed.

§ “But grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.”] These two words, *grace* and *truth*, stand here in antithesis, or opposition, to the moral and ceremonial law, which was given by Moses. For though Christ was the giver of the law, as well as of the gospel; and though the giving of the law, was a work of grace,—and the doctrine of the law, a work of truth,—yet, if the tenor of the law and the gospel be compared together, they will be found to differ mainly in these particulars, though there be a grace and truth to be found in either of them:—

First; The law, indeed, held out the doctrine of salvation, and taught of good things to come; but it was so darkly and obscurely, and in such veiled types and shadows, that it was rather groped after, than seen: and, therefore, those things are called ‘darkness,’ at the fifth verse of this chapter: and the Jews that lived under them, yea, and gained salvation from the knowledge of them, yet are said to be, “not perfect without us^h”; that is, imperfect in the knowledge of the doctrine of salvation, till the gospel brought us Gentiles in. But the gospel revealed Christ, and the way of salvation, so clearly, and in so evident and plain a manner,—that all those types, shadows, predictions, and representations, received their equity, accomplishment, and fulfilling; and it showed apparently, what was the substance

^h Heb. xi. 40.

and intention of them: so that what the law held out in figures, the gospel did in truth.

Secondly; Although the law were, in the spirit and marrow of it, a doctrine of faith,—yet, in the letter and outward administration of it, it was but a messenger of deathⁱ; challenging exact performance, which no man could yield,—and denouncing a curse upon him, that performed it not; and so concluded all men under sin and a curse. But the gospel cometh, and preacheth to another tune, and to a more comfortable tenor, promising remission to the penitent, though they had not performed what the law required,—and assuring salvation to the believer, though he had no works nor righteousness of his own to own: and thus it speaketh grace and pardon, whereas the other did a curse and condemnation. And, therefore, is it divinely thus opposed by the evangelist, betwixt the law and the gospel, in these two particulars, according to the two parts of the law, moral and ceremonial,—and according to the two main doctrines of the gospel, repentance and believing.

For the moral called for obedience, and challenged them under condemnation, that obeyed it not: but grace and pardon came by Christ, and was offered in the gospel to those, that should repent for their not obeying.

The ceremonial law preached Christ under obscure representations, and difficult to grope him through; but the truth of what those obscurities involved, and what those representations figured, came by Christ; and the gospel holds it out, and calls for faith in him, that hath accomplished them. And thus is ‘grace’ and ‘truth’ said to come by Jesus Christ,—and these to be the tenor of the gospel, in opposition to the law; not as grace opposeth ungraciousness, but as it opposeth condemning; nor as truth opposeth falsehood, but as it opposeth shadows.

Ver. 18: “No man hath seen God at any time.”] This is spoken from Exod. xxxiii, about Moses’s desiring to see the Lord.

The foregoing verse made a difference between Moses and Christ, which this verse pursueth; Moses desired to see God, but could not see him^j, for no man hath seen God, or can see him,—and live; but Christ hath been in his bosom, hath seen him, and revealed him. Moses beggeth to know the way of God, and God promiseth him the company of his

ⁱ 2 Cor. iii. 7.

^j Exod. xxxiii. 20.

presence^k; he beggeth again to see his *glory*, and God answereth him, that he will show him his *goodness*^l; and more of God he saw not: and so much of God hath none seen besides him, but only the begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father. The story of Moses is divinely alluded to in this place; for, as concerning the presence of God, the evangelist saith, ‘he dwelt among us:’ as concerning his glory, he saith, that ‘they beheld it;’ and as concerning his goodness, he concludeth, he was ‘full of grace and truth,’ ver. 14. And though no man hath seen God at any time, yet Christ imaged him forth among his disciples, with a glory agreeing to the only-begotten Son of God; and he hath declared him plainly in the doctrine of the gospel, a doctrine full of grace and truth.

“He hath declared him.”] It is apparent by this clause, that the evangelist’s main intention hereabout, is to speak of the doctrine and declaration of God, Christ, and the gospel, and the publication of all unto the world; he speaks of John’s publishing of this^m; and of John’s publishing of this againⁿ; and of Moses’s publishing of this in his kind^o; and of Christ’s doing it in his kind^p: And, therefore, certainly it cannot but be unconsonant to the scope of the place, and to the purpose of the penman, to interpret the sixteenth verse clean to another tune, about receiving grace of remission and sanctification. And this is that that hath mainly induced me to interpret it as I have done; because I see it plainly, that the evangelist applies himself in the whole context to treat concerning the witnesses, and the publication and declaration of Christ and the gospel.

Ver. 19: “The Jews sent priests and Levites.”] The baptism and ministry of John was of so strange a tenor, as was observed before [viz. that, whereas the law preached for works, he should call for repentance,—and, whereas baptism had been used hitherto for admission of heathens to the religion of the Jews, he should now use it to admit the Jews to a new religion], that it is no wonder, if that court, who were to take notice and cognizance of matters of this nature, were very inquisitive and scrupulous after the business, to know John’s authority, and his intention. It is rather to be wondered at, that they had let him alone all this while, and never

^k Exod. xxxiii. 13, 14.

ⁿ Ver. 19.

^l Ver. 18, 19.

^o Ver. 17.

^m John, i. 15.

^p Ver. 18.

had him in examination yet. John had now followed this course and calling, about eight months together; and six of these eight had he spent in Judea, in their own country; and yet, for aught we read, they had never quarrelled with him till this very time. Now, what the cause of their long forbearing should be, is hardly worthy the inquiring after; only this we cannot but acknowledge a chief reason of it,—namely, God so dispensing and disposing, that his ministry might run uninterrupted, or without any let, till Christ should begin to show himself in his ministry; which, the very next day after this dispute, he did. And so the gospel might have no stop in this beginning of it; but, while Christ preached not, John should preach without trouble; and when John began to be troubled, Christ should then be ready to preach.

The scrutiny and judging of a prophet, belonged only to the Sanhedrim, or great council at Jerusalem; and so is the Talmudic tradition, in the treatise Sanhedrim, cap. 1:—“They judge not a tribe, nor a false prophet, nor the high-priest, but in the judicatory of seventy-and-one.” And to this law and practice of theirs, those words of Christ relate in Luke xiii. 33; “It cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem:” because a prophet could not be judged upon life and death in any place but there.

This court and council sent these messengers to John, to make inquiry after him, and after his authority; and so is the word, *the Jews*, to be understood in this verse, for the representative body of the Jews in the great judicatory. And they send “priests and Levites” to examine him, as men of the greatest knowledge and learning in the law, and men of the likeliest abilities to try him, and to dispute and discourse with him; according to that in Mal. ii. 7; “The priest’s lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth.”

Ver. 20: “But confessed, ‘I am not the Christ.’”] We do not perceive, by the text, that this question, ‘whether he were the Christ, or no,’ was proposed to him at all; yet he giveth satisfaction to this first, partly, because the time of Christ’s appearing was now generally thought, by the nation, to be at hand^a; and partly, because the eminency of John had made the people look upon him, with some questioning whether he were not the Christ^r.

^a Luke, ii. 26, 38; xix. 11; and xxiv. 31. John, iv. 25, &c.

^r Luke, iii. 15.

Ver. 21: "Art thou Elias?"] When he hath resolved them that he is not the Messias; they presently question, whether he be not Elias, Messias's forerunner: for their expectation was of the forerunner's bodily coming, as well as of Christ's. Their opinions concerning Elias's first coming, and who he was then,—and of his latter coming, and what they look for from him then,—it is not impertinent to take up a little, in their words and authors.

"Some of our Rabbins, of happy memory (saith Levi Gerson), have held, that Elias was Phinehas; and this they have held, because they found some correspondency betwixt them. And behold, it is written in the law, that the blessed God gave him his covenant of peace. And the prophet saith, My covenant was with him of life and peace: and by this it seemeth, that God gave to Phinehas length of days to admiration: and behold, we find that he was priest in the days of the concubine, at Gibeah; and in the days of David, we find it written, And Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, was ruler over them of old, and the Lord was with him, 1 Chron. ix. 20. And he was the angel that appeared to Gideon, and to Jephthah; and the Spirit of the Lord carried him like an angel; as we find also of Elias. And for this it is said, They shall seek the law at his mouth, for he is the angel of the Lord; and for this cause also he saith, Before-time, and the Lord was with him. And behold, we find Elias himself saying unto the Lord, 'Take now my life from me, for I am no better than my fathers:' meaning, that it was not for him to live always in this world, but a certain space after the way of the earth, for he was no better than his fathers. We find also that he died not, after he was taken away from the head of Elisha; for there came afterward a writing of Elias, to Jehoram, the son of Jehoshaphat, as it is mentioned in the Book of Chronicles." Thus Ralbag on 1 Kings xvii. And thus the Jews hold Phinehas and Elias to have been but one and the same man.

And what they held concerning Elias's singular eminency for prophecy whilst he lived, it appeareth by R. Samuel Laniado, in his comment on 2 Kings ii: "Elias (saith he) was so endued with prophecy, that many of the children of the prophets prophesied by his means. Our wise men, of happy memory, say, Whilst Elias was not laid up, the Holy Ghost was in Israel, as it is said, the children of the prophets that

were at Beth-el, said to Elisha, To-day God will take thy master from thy head: they went and stood afar off, and they passed over Jordan: it may be, because they were but a few: the sense telleth, that there were fifty men of the sons of the prophets: it may be, they were private men: the text saith, Thy master: it is not said, Our master, but, Thy master; showing, that they were wise men like Elias. When Elias was taken up^r, the Holy Ghost departed from them; as it is said, And they said, Behold, there is with thy servants fifty men, men of strength; let them go and seek thy master," &c.

And concerning the departure of Elias, and his estate after, the same author giveth the opinion of his nation, a little after, in these words: "I believe the words of our wise men, of happy memory, 'That Elias was taken away in a whirlwind in the heaven,' that is, in the air; and the Spirit took him to the earthly paradise, and there he abideth in body and soul: therefore they say, that Elias died not: and they say moreover, that he went not into the firmament: and they say, that some have seen him in the school^s, and that he shall come before the great and terrible day of the Lord come."

Now, his coming before the day of the Lord, they hold to be twofold,—one invisible, as that he cometh to the circumcision of every child; and, therefore, they set him a chair, and suppose he sitteth there, though they see him not: "And the angel of the covenant which you desire, behold, he cometh: 'The Lord shall come to his temple^t;' this is the King Messias, who also is the angel of the covenant. Or he saith, 'The angel of the covenant,' in reference to Elias: and so it is said, That Elias was zealous for the covenant of circumcision, which the kingdom of Ephraim restrained from themselves; as it is said, 'I have been exceeding zealous for the Lord God of Israel, for the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant.' He saith unto him, Thou wast zealous in Shittim^u; and art thou zealous here concerning circumcision? As thou livest, Israel shall not do the covenant of circumcision, till thou seest it with thine eyes. From hence they have appointed to make an honourable chair for Elias, who is called 'the angel of the covenant.'" Thus Kimchi on Mal. iii. 1.

^r בבית המדרש treasured up.

^t Mal. iii. 1.

^s בבית המדרש

^u Phinehas in Num. xxv.

Of this matter, and of the Jews' present expectation of Elias at every circumcision, the learned Buxtorfius giveth an ample relation, in his *Synagoga Judaica*, cap. 2.

“On the eighth day in the morning (saith he) those things that are requisite for the circumcision, are duly prepared. And first of all, two seats are set, or one seat so made, as that two may sit one by another in it, covered with rich coverings, or cushions, according as every one's state will bear. In the one of these seats, when the child cometh to be circumcised, sitteth the sponsor, or godfather, of the child; and the other seat is set for Elias: for they conceive, that Elias cometh along with the infant, and sitteth down in that seat, to observe whether the circumcision be rightly administered: and this they conceive from Mal. iii. 1, ‘And the messenger of the covenant whom ye seek, behold, he cometh.’ When they set that seat for Elias, they are bound to say in express words, ‘This is the seat of the prophet Elias.’ That seat is left standing there, three whole days together. Rabbi Juda, the holy, once perceived that Elias came not to one circumcision, and the reason was, because the child circumcised should once turn Christian, and forsake his Judaism. They used to lay the child upon Elias's cushion, both before and after his circumcision, that Elias may touch him.” Thus he, and more largely, about their fancy of Elias's invisible coming upon that occasion. And, in the thirteenth chapter of the same book, he relateth how they expect him visibly at the other sacrament, even every Passover; when, among other rites and foolish customs, they use, over a cup of wine, to curse all the people of the world, that are not Jews, as they are: and that they do in this prayer,—“Pour out thy wrath upon the nations, which have not known thee; and upon the kingdoms that have not called upon thy name; pour thine anger upon them, and let the fury of thy wrath lay hold of them,” &c. Which while the master of the house is praying, one runs to the gate, or door of the house, and sets it wide open, in sign of their deliverance, and in hope of Elias's coming to tell them of the approach of the Messiah: and presently in comes one clothed in white, that their children may believe, that Elias is now come among them indeed.

And in the eleventh chapter of the same book, he relateth, that, every sabbath-day, at night, they call hard upon

Elias, and, since he vouchsafed not to come among them on the sabbath, which is now past, they earnestly entreat him, that he would come the next sabbath-day. And their rabbins and wise men have taught them, that Elias, every sabbath-day, sitting under the tree of life in Paradise, takes account of, and writeth down, the good works of the Jews, in their keeping of the sabbath.

I shall trespass too much upon the reader's patience, if I trouble him with any more such trash and ridiculous stuff, as this is, about this matter: I have been the bolder with him, that I might the more fully show the earnest and foolish expectation of that blinded nation in this particular. I shall only crave leave to allege some few expressions more out of their own authors upon this subject,—that here, once for all, their doctrine and opinion of the coming of Elias [which cometh in mention now and then in the evangelists], may be handled, and may trouble us no more.

Their second and greater expectation, then, of Elias, is, that he will come, visibly and bodily, before the coming of the Messiah: and that he will do great things, when he cometh. The disciples well knew and spake the common opinion of the nation, when, upon our Saviour's discourse concerning his own resurrection, they make this reply; “Why, then, say the scribes, that Elias must first come^w?”

And so are their authors full of assertions to such a purpose.

“The four carpenters in Zechary [saith Rabbi Simeon] are Messias Ben David, Messias Ben Joseph, Elias, and the Priest of righteousness^x.”

“Elias shall restore three things in Israel [saith Rabbi Tanchuma], the pot of manna, the cruse of the anointing oil, and the cruse of water; and also, as some say, Aaron's rod, with its blossoms and almonds^y.”

The Talmudists in Erubhin^z are discoursing of this coming of Elias, and inquiring the time; and they have this conclusion, “That Israel is assured, that Elias will not come but on the evening of the sabbaths, or on the evening of festival-days; and when he cometh, they shall say to the great Sanhedrim, He is come^a.”

And in the treatise of the Sabbath, they intimate, that

^w Matt. xvii. 10.

^x Vid. Kimch. in Zech. i.

^y Tanch. on Exod. i.

^z Cap. 4.

^a Fol. 43.

one work of Elias, when he thus cometh, shall be to destroy. “Every one (say they) that observes steadfastly three repasts on the sabbath, is delivered from three vengeance; from Messias’s destroying, from the judgment of hell, and from the war of Gog and Magog. From the destruction of Messias; it is written here, Remember the day, viz. the sabbath-day: and it is written there, ‘Behold, I send unto you Elias the prophet before the day come^b,’” &c.

And in a common and current proverb among them, they hold, that another work of Elias, when he cometh, shall be to resolve doubts and scruples, and to untie doctrinal knots.

And that he shall purify bastards, and make them fit to come into the congregation, ארזל כי אליהו יטהר המכזרים, וישבם בקהלה Vid. Kimchi. in Zech. ix.

And that he shall be one of the seven shepherds, and eight principal ones, mentioned Micah v. 5. “Our Rabbins say, Who are the seven shepherds? David in the middle,—Seth, Enoch, and Methuselah on his right hand,—and Abraham, and Jacob, and Moses, on his left. And who are the eight principal ones? Jesse, Saul, Samuel, Amos, Zephaniah, Hezekiah, Elias, and Messiah^c.”

And for this coming of Elias, doth Elias Levita so heartily pray^d,—“Elias was in the days of Gibeah: so let it be God’s good will, that he may be with us in this time, and let that verse be accomplished upon us, ‘Behold, I send you Elias;’ so is the prayer of Elias the author.”

By these, and divers other speeches of the like nature, which might be produced out of the Hebrew authors, showing the common opinion of that people concerning the coming of Elias bodily before the coming of Christ,—it is no wonder, if, when the Jews saw so eminent a man as John the Baptist come in so powerful a way of ministry, so great a change of a sacrament, and so strict austerity of life,—they question with themselves, and with him, whether he be not the Messias; and, when he denies that,—then, whether he be not Elias. But it is some wonder [and that the rather, because our Saviour hath long ago resolved what was meant by that place of the prophet, ‘Behold, I send Elias,’ and hath plainly told that John the Baptist was the

^b Cap. 16. fol. 118.

^c Kimch. in Micah. v.

^d In Tisbi, in rad. Tishbi.

Elias that was to come]; I say, it is a wonder [this considered], that ever this Jewish opinion of Elias's coming before the coming of the Messiah, should be so transplanted into the hearts of Christians, under this notion of Elias's coming before Christ's second coming, as that so many understand it as literally, personally, and really, as ever the grossest Jew in Judea did.

It were endless to reckon their names, both ancient and modern, that have verily believed, and as boldly asserted, that Enoch and Elias shall come visibly and bodily to destroy antichrist, to convert the Jews, and to build up the elect in the faith of Christ. He that desires names, may see enough in Bellarmine de Roman. Pontif. lib. 3. cap. 6; where he proves that the pope is not antichrist, by this argument,—that Elias and Enoch never came against him; in Cornelius a Lapide in Apocal. xi, where he holds the two witnesses to be these two men, Enoch and Elias.

It is somewhat beside our work, to take up this controversy in this place; but it may not be besides the advantage of the reader, to take up two or three considerations upon this matter, and to ruminate and study upon them, towards the confutation of this groundless opinion.

1. That 'the great and terrible day of the Lord,' before which Elias was promised to come, is exceedingly mistaken by those that understand it of 'the day of judgment:' for it meaneth only, 'the day of the destruction of Jerusalem;' as might be proved at large by divers other places of Scripture, where the same phrase is used. And the like misconstruction is there of the phrase, 'in the last days,' by taking it for 'the last days of the world;' whereas it meaneth only 'the last days of Jerusalem.'

2. Those two witnesses, mentioned Rev. xi, upon whom there are so various glosses and different opinions, are pictured and characterized out like Moses and Elias, and not like Enoch and Elias, as is plain by the text: for that speaketh of shutting up heaven, turning water into blood, and plaguing the earth; which had been the actings of Elias and Moses, and none but they; and no mention of Enoch's ever doing such a thing at all. We have, therefore, from that place, as little warrant to look for Elias's bodily coming before the end of the world, as we have for the bodily coming of Moses.

3. The proper meaning of that prophecy concerning the two witnesses, is to set forth the state of the church towards the end of the world, “when the Jews shall be called, and knit together into one church with the Gentiles;” showing, that God will raise up a powerful ministry among either people: which the Holy Ghost characters, by “Moses, the first minister and prophet of the Jews, and Elias, the first minister and prophet of the Gentiles.” These two people, and this double ministry, are “as two olive-trees and two candlesticks, standing before the Lord of the whole earth.” This ministry shall be opposed by antichrist, and almost destroyed and brought to nothing. And, as antichrist hath caused a general defection and apostasy already in the world, having even slain religion, and the preaching of the truth, till, in the age last past, they revived again,—so shall he cause a defection and falling away, for a season, in the church of the Jews after their calling; so that religion and the truth shall be, in a manner, extinguished among them, that antichrist may make the measure of his iniquity full. And as Rome, in her heathenish power, did first destroy the old Jerusalem, and then persecute the new,—so must she do in her antichristian power and mischievousness: first undo the Christian church, consisting of heathens only, as it hath done already in the dark time of Popery over all the world; and then undo the church, consisting of Gentiles and Jews united together. But God shall revive it; and then the true religion, and the ministry of the truth, shall live again by the power and Spirit of God put into them.

That this is the aim of that prophecy, in the eleventh of the Revelation, might be showed, if it were seasonable, by many arguments,—and, consequently, that the expectation of Enoch and Elias to come bodily, and to fight with antichrist, &c, hath not the least colour or ground from thence at all: but this is not a place to dispute that text.

§ “Art thou that prophet?”] There is some question, whether to read it in the force of the article, or no; there are some that do read it so, and some that do not. The Syriac and the Vulgar Latin take no notice of the article at all, but read it as if it were without: ‘Art thou a prophet?’ And so doth the margin of our English Bible.—But others, with our English text, do interpret the words as speaking of some peculiar prophet, which was neither Christ nor

Elias, but some other pointed at, and intended, by that prediction, Deut. xviii. 15^e.

It is hard to guess at the mind of these Jews, that speak these words we have in hand; for, both the Greek expression, in this text, and the Jews' exposition of that in Deuteronomy, do so indifferently carry it, either to a prophet, in general, or, to some singular prophet, in particular; that it may be an equilibrious case, whether to take it the one way, or the other. I rather take it the former; and cannot but apprehend, that their questioning of the Baptist, in these words, ὁ προφήτης εἶ σὺ; is indefinitely meant,—‘art thou a prophet?’ not ‘this or that prophet, but, art thou a prophet at all?’—For prophecy had been long decayed amongst them: and, when they saw one appear now of so prophetic a character, as the Baptist was;—and when he had resolved them he was neither Christ nor Elias, their properest question then was, ‘Art thou, then, any other prophet, come after so long a time, as there have been no prophets among us?’ And he answers, ‘No;’ that is, not in their sense; not a prophet of the same ministry with those in the Old Testament, revived, as Matt. xvi. 14; but a minister foretold of, by one of those prophets; as Isa. xl. 3.

The reason that I refuse the strict interpretation of this question, “Art thou *that* prophet?” as if they spake of some particular man, is, partly, because the article ὁ is not always to be construed in such a strictness, as pointing out a particular thing, or person; but is, very commonly, nay, most commonly, of a more large and general signification: but chiefly, because I find not, in the Jewish writers, any particular prophet mentioned, whom they expected to come, as they did Christ and Elias: and, for aught I find, they do not interpret that place, in Deut. xviii. 15, of any such a particular person; but of the succession of prophets, in general. It is true, indeed, that Aben Ezra understands it of Joshua; and Rab. Solomon, on Jer. i, understands it of Jeremiah; but this was of Joshua and Jeremiah, in their times: but of any such singular person, that they expected in the last times, I find no mention, unless ‘the Priest of righteousness,’ spoken of a little before, or ‘Messias Ben Joseph,’ should be reduced under this notion and name of ‘*that* prophet.’

* Vide Cyril and Chrysos. &c.

Ver. 25: "Why baptizest thou then?"] It is observable, that they never question what he meant by his baptism, but why he meant to baptize: they inquire not concerning the thing, but concerning his person and authority. And, in all the time of his course and ministry, we never find, that they made the least scruple what his baptism was, or what it meant: but only they look on him, and wonder, and question, what he hath to do to baptize. And the reason of this was, because the rite and custom of baptizing, had been in common and ordinary practice and use among that nation, many hundreds of years before John ever appeared among them. And, as this common and known custom of baptism, used among them continually and ordinarily so long before, and then, made them that they never wonder, nor question, nor make strange, of John's baptizing, as to the thing itself; so the consideration of this very thing, may give us much light and satisfaction in that controversy, that is now a-foot among us,—concerning the baptizing or not baptizing of infants. It is urged, by those that deny infants' baptism,—that there is neither command for it, nor example of it, in Scripture, as there was for infant circumcision. Now, this consideration giveth one ready answer, if there were no other to be given:—If baptism, and baptizing of infants, had been as strange, and unseen, and unheard-of, a thing in the world, till John the Baptist came, as circumcision was, till God appointed it to Abraham,—there is no doubt but there would have been a command or example expressly given for the baptizing of infants, if God would have them to be baptized; as there was for the circumcising of infants, because God would have them to be circumcised.—But, when the baptizing of infants had been a thing as commonly known, and as commonly used, long before John came, and to his very coming, as any holy thing, that was used among the Jews; and they were as well acquainted with infants' baptism, as they were with infants' circumcision,—it doth not follow, that there needed so express and punctual a command or example, to be given for the baptizing of infants, which was well enough known already, as there needed for circumcision of infants or others; which was a thing, that, till its institution, had never been heard of, nor dreamed of, in the world.

I shall crave a little leave of the reader for so much digression [for so, I know, he cannot but account it], as, from the Jews' authors and antiquities, to give him some account of these two particulars; which, it may be, may prove of some use in the point in mention; viz. 1. The ancient use and practice of baptism among the Jews, before the gospel began to be preached by John the Baptist. And, 2. The common use and practice of baptizing of infants in those times.

1. Of the antiquity, and long and ancient use, of baptism under the law, we have, first, this testimony in Maimonides, the great register of the Jews' customs and antiquities, in his treatise Issure Biah, cap. 13.

“By three things (saith he), Israel entered into covenant,—by circumcision, baptism, and sacrifice.

“Circumcision was in Egypt: as it is said, No uncircumcised person shall eat thereof. Moses, our master, circumcised them; for they had all forsaken the covenant of circumcision in Egypt, but only the tribe of Levi: as it is said, And they keep thy covenant.

“Baptism was in the wilderness, before the giving of the law: as it is said, And thou shalt sanctify them to-day and to-morrow, and let them wash their garments.

“And sacrifice: as it is said, And he sent the young men of the children of Israel, and they offered burnt-offerings; they offered them for all Israel.

“And so, in after-times, when a heathen will enter into the covenant, and be gathered and joined under the wings of the divine Majesty, and take upon him the yoke of the law,—circumcision, and baptism, and a free-will offering, is required:—and, if it be a female,—baptism, and an offering: as it is said, ככס כגר As it is with you, so shall it be with the stranger. How is it with you? With circumcision, and baptism, and a free offering. So also the stranger, for ever, with circumcision, and baptism, and a free offering, &c. But, at this time, when there are no offerings, circumcision and baptism are necessary; but when the house of the sanctuary shall be built, then shall he also bring an offering. A stranger, that is circumcised, and not baptized; or, that is baptized and not circumcised; is not a proselyte, till he be both circumcised and baptized.” Thus Maimonides: and to the same tenor the Talmud, also, in Jebamoth, cap. 4.

“A stranger that is circumcised and not baptized (Rabbi Eliezer saith), behold, he is a proselyte; for so we find by our fathers, which were circumcised and not baptized.”

“He that is baptized and not circumcised (Rabbi Jehoshua saith), behold, he is a proselyte; for so we find by the maids that were baptized, but not circumcised: but the wise men say, Is he baptized and not circumcised; or, is he circumcised and not baptized? He is not a proselyte, until he be both circumcised and baptized.”

“It is necessary (saith Maimonides again), that he be baptized before a triumvirate, or before a consistory of three. If a man come and say, I was proselyted in such a consistory, and they baptized me; he is not trusted to come into the congregation till he bring witness. As they circumcise and baptize proselytes, so they circumcise and baptize servants taken from heathens.” And, a little after, he mentioneth the place and manner of baptizing; and what multitudes were proselyted, in the days of David and Solomon, and baptized, before private persons: because the Sanhedrim would not then admit proselytes, solemnly, as at other times; suspecting they might be proselyted either for fear of the power, or for love of the pomp, of Israel, in those times; yet he concludes, that “whosoever was circumcised and baptized, though only before private persons, and though for some by-respect,—yet, being circumcised and baptized, he was come out of the state of heathenism.” Much more might be produced out of their own authors,—men, enemies to our baptism; and the testimony of an enemy is a double testimony: but this is enough to show the antiquity, common use, and ordinary knownness, of baptism, under the law, long before the times of John the Baptist, sometimes used single without circumcision, but most commonly joined with it. By which we may observe, that baptism was no strange thing when John came baptizing; but the rite was known so well by every one, that nothing was better known than what baptism was: and, therefore, there needed not such punctual and exact rules, about the manner and object of it, as there had needed, if it had never been seen before. What needed it in the gospel to tell, that such or such persons were to be the objects of baptism, when it was as well known, before the gospel began, that men, and women, and children, were the objects of baptism, and were

baptized,—as it is to be known, that the sun is up, when it shineth at noon-day?

These two things, therefore, are observable, about our Saviour's instituting baptism for a gospel-sacrament:—

1. That 'he took up baptism, which was used as an additional to circumcision, instead of circumcision:'—and so did he also in the other sacrament of the Lord's supper. For, after the paschal lamb was eaten, it was the common custom of the nation, that the master of the family brake a piece of bread, and distributed it among the company; and, after it, he distributed a cup of wine: now, our Saviour took up this, which was an additional to the Passover, to be a gospel-sacrament instead of the Passover.

2. That 'he took up baptism as it was in common and known use, and in ordinary and familiar practice, among the nation; and, therefore, gave no rules for the manner of baptizing, or for the age or sex of the persons to be baptized, which was well enough known already, and needed no rule to be prescribed.'

Now, for the second thing proposed, and about which there is the greatest difference and controversy among Christians, in the matter of baptism, which is about the baptizing of infants,—the Jews used it also in as common and ordinary practice, as they did to baptize any others; as appeareth also by these their own testimonies:—

In the Talmud^f they have these words; "Rab. Hona saith, A little one they baptize by the appointment of the consistory" קטון מטבילין אותו על דעת בית דין. The Hebrew gloss upon that place saith, "If he have not a father, and his mother bring him to be proselyted, they baptize him, because there is no proselyte without circumcision and baptism. And there must be three at his baptism [as three are necessary at the baptism of every proselyte], and they become a father to him, and he is made a proselyte by their hands."

The Talmud text proceedeth thus, מאי קמ"ל דזכות הוא לו זכין, "What do we learn hence? That he hath benefit by it; and they privilege a man, even though he knew it not:" [for so doth the gloss interpret the words לא בפניו "not to his face," that is, saith he, לא מדעתו "not to his knowledge;" and a little one is not בר דיעה capable of understanding.] תנינא זכין לאד שלא בפניו אין הבין לאד שלא בפניו

^f In Chetuboth, cap. 1.

“It is a tradition, that they privilege a person though he know it not,—but they do not disprivilege a person, without his knowledge.” And thus do they answer that objection, that is now a-foot against infants’ baptism, viz.—that it is not fit that they should be baptized, because they have no understanding:—they make it a ‘non sequitur;’ “for (say they) a privilege may be put upon a person, though he himself know not of it.” And in the very place, out of which these words are cited, even a little before them, the Talmudics speak of “a proselytess, and a captivess, and a maid, redeemed, proselyted, and manumitted, being less than three years old and a half:” and they have a case upon it about contracts and dower.

And Maimonides, in the treatise Abadim, or concerning servants, chap. 8, at the very conclusion of the chapter, hath this saying; *ישראל שתקף בגוי קטן או מצא תינוק גוי והטבילו* “An Israelite that takes a little heathen, or that finds a heathen infant, and baptizeth him into the name of a proselyte,—behold, he is a proselyte.” And in the treatise Issure Biah, in the chapter cited ere while, he saith, “A woman proselyted and baptized, when she is great with child, her child needeth not then to be baptized, when he is born:” otherwise, it was requisite that he should be baptized. By these and other testimonies, which might be produced, it is apparent, that baptism, and baptism of infants, was in common use before John appeared. And it doth not only show a reason, why the Jews never question him what baptism meant, but by what authority he did baptize,—but also it showeth a reason, why the New Testament is so sparing in expressing the object and manner of baptism,—namely, because both baptism itself, and those things, were commonly and ordinarily used and known before.

Ver. 28: “In Bethabara, beyond Jordan.”] It is but as labour lost to go about to show, how many translators and expositors approve this translation, ‘beyond Jordan,’—since there is not any to be found, that ever took this word *πέραν* in other sense, till Beza found a new. Now he translates it ‘secus Jordanem,’ not *beyond* but *besides* Jordan: and so doth he likewise, Matt. iv. 15, and xix. 1: and, indeed, with some probability at the first appearance: but when the signification of the word *πέραν*, and the history, and historical sense, of these places alleged, is better viewed, we shall find

his interpretation contradicted by both. For, first, the word *πέραν* doth most properly and genuinely signify *ultra* or *trans*, and not *juxta* or *secus*, *beyond* and not *besides*; as might be evidenced by most copious examples, both in Scripture and heathen writers. We shall not be tedious in allegations, in which we might be even endless; take but these two pregnant ones for a pattern,—Matt. viii. 18; John vi. 1; xvii. 25; and xviii. 1; Mark iv. 35; and v. 1, &c; and divers places in the LXX: and it will be hard, if not impossible, to show where ever *πέραν* signifieth *secus*. To which may be added, the signification of several words derived from this,—as *περάσιμος*, *περάω*, and others, which all carry in them the signification of “going beyond, over, or to the other side.”

Secondly, Consider but the progress of John in his baptizing. He first beginneth in Judea, and coasteth on that side Jordan within the land of Canaan^s; and kept not fixed to this or that place, but moved up and down at a large distance, and had disciples come to him to be baptized from a very large circuit; as is evident by those expressions of Luke and Matthew, “He came into all the country about Jordan,” Luke iii. 3; “And there went out to him all the regions about Jordan,” Matt. iii. 5. And, withal, Luke saith, “that all the people were baptized” by the time, that our Saviour came to his baptism, Luke iii. 21: which I cannot see how it should be understood otherwise, than that John had made all his harvest, and finished all the ministry, that he should use on that side the river, which he had now coasted upon a whole half year together: now, therefore, he was to remove to the other side.

Thirdly, It cannot but be an impropriety to talk of John’s baptizing ‘besides’ Jordan; as if, when he baptized in Bethabara, he baptized in Jordan itself, as Beza himself denieth not.

Fourthly, The people say to John^h, “Rabbi, he that was with thee, *πέραν Ἰορδάνου* baptizeth.” Now, if this be to be rendered, ‘besides’ Jordan, how needless will this appear,—since John, all the half year that he baptized, was hardly any where else? And this impropriety, it is very like, caused Beza to translate it there “ad trajectum Jordanis;” by what warrant of the Greek, I cannot see. And as for those two places that he allegeth to confirm his sense,—namely,

^s Matt. iii. 1.

^h In chap. iii. 26.

Matt. iv. 15, and xix. 1,—the shortness of the language, that the evangelist hath used in both places, was that that drove him into this interpretation. For the text of Matt. iv. 15, cited from Isa. ix. 1, doth so plainly speak to the 2 Kings xv. 29, that it is past all doubting; as will be cleared there. Now, in that text of the Kings, there is evident expression of affliction of Israel on both sides Jordan; which Isaiah speaking to, doth utter it very short, as it is usual with the Scripture to do, when it speaketh from known stories. And as for that in Matt. xix. 1, the harmonizing of the evangelists will show it most undoubted, that Jesus, in that story, did go over Jordan indeed; as may be seen, John x. 40, and xi. 7, which speak in reference to this very story: but both Matthew and Mark have given the story in so short terms, as breedeth ambiguity to him that shall look no farther than their texts for the exposition one of another. For they only say thus, “He departed from Galilee; and came into the coasts of Judea beyond Jordan:” but their meaning is this, that he came into the coasts of Judea, and so beyond Jordan: for the story of that one verse comprehendeth as much story, as is contained from John vii. 10, to John x. 40. And, whereas those evangelists say only thus much briefly, “He came into the coasts of Judea,” the story at length was this,—“He came to Jerusalem, and there he stayed, from the feast of tabernaclesⁱ, which was in September, till the feast of dedication, which was in December^j: then he goeth to the other side of Jordan^k,” as shall be cleared past denial, by God’s assistance, when his providence and goodness shall bring us thither. So that in both these texts alleged, the ellipsis, or want of the conjunction *and*, which is most common in the Scripture style, hath bred this difficulty; and that being added [as the very nature and truth of the thing itself requireth it to be understood], the doubt had been removed: the places being read thus, “The way of the sea beyond Jordan and Galilee of the Gentiles: and he came into the coasts of Judea, and beyond Jordan.”

Now, where this Bethabara was, beyond Jordan, is still under scruple; it is very commonly apprehended to be בית עברה ‘The place of passage;’ either where Israel came over when they entered the land,—or the common ford that the

ⁱ John, vii. 2. 10.^j John, x. 22.^k Ver. 40.

people went over from one side to another, from Judea to Perea, at the fords of Jericho.

Now, as for the first, it is a very uncertain scantling; seeing that the space of Israel's passage, as was observed on Luke iii. 21, was very many miles. And as for the second, it carrieth great probability with it, if it can but be satisfied, how Christ and his disciples could travel from thence to Cana, in Galilee, in three days, nay, to be there at a feast on the third day. The tenth chapter of John, and the fortieth verse, must help us to some light in this obscurity. It is said there, that "Jesus went again beyond Jordan, into the place where John at first baptized;" upon which text, let us take up these observations:—

1. That Jesus, in this story, went 'ultra,' or 'trans Jordanem,' over the river, and not only aside of it: for, in John xi. 7, he saith unto his disciples, "Let us go into Judea again." Now, had he not gone over Jordan, he had been in Judea already.

2. That he went to the place, "where John at first baptized,"—that is, where he first baptized beyond Jordan; this was Bethabara.

3. That he went over Jordan, at the fords of Jericho: for he went the common road from Jerusalem to Perea; or, at the least, most certainly he came back again at that passage: compare Luke xviii. 31 with 35.

4. That Bethabara was not adjoining to Jordan at that passage, but at some distance from it: for if we look into this story of his journey beyond Jordan, in the other evangelists, we shall find, that he had some journeys beyond the river; as Mark x. 17, "One came to him, when he was gone forth upon his journey," whilst he was beyond Jordan.

The opinion, therefore, of Jerome, cannot be current, that holdeth Bethabara to be buildings at the passage of Jericho, on either side Jordan, one over-against another, on the river's brink: for then, how could Christ, having passed over at that passage, travel when he was beyond Jordan, and yet go but to Bethabara? But it seemeth rather to me, that this place was far more northward up Jordan, and lay over-against Galilee; and that Christ, going over at the passage of Jericho, coasted up a good way on the left hand, many miles, before he came to Bethabara. And I should rather suppose, that it was called Bethabara, or 'the place of pas-

sage,' as being the landing-place on the other side of the point of the lake Gennesaret, over-against Galilee, than the landing-place on the other side of Jordan, over-against Jericho.

And the reasons, that induce me to place it there, are these:—

1. Because John had coasted up and down Jordan on Judea-side for a long time together, and there he had gathered up all the converts that were to be had: what, then, would it avail him to go on the other side the river, just opposite to the places, where he had been so long? The river was not above twenty or thirty yards over; or grant it twice or thrice so much; nay, grant it fifty, as Baal Haturim, on Num. x: and the time that he had spent on Judea-side, was all the summer; and why should it be thought, that converts were now to be had on the farther side, which might, with as much facility, have come thirty or forty yards farther to him to the other side Jordan, especially in summer, it being no great water to get over?

2. Because of the quickness of Christ's journey from Bethabara unto Cana; which was travelled by him in far less than three days. The first night he came to Capernaum, the city of his abode, ver. 39, as we shall show there; and that two hours before night, which from the fords of Jericho was impossible to do, unless he had showed a miracle; which in this we know he did not.

3. It is a great persuasive to believe, that John was now baptizing near Galilee, because of the Galileans, Peter and Andrew, conversing with him.

Ver. 29: "Behold the Lamb of God." This is the first time, that John pointeth out Christ personally, or demonstrateth to the people, "This is the man." He had hitherto spoken of him, and borne witness to him continually, to all that came to be baptized by him, both before Christ's baptism, and since; but till now he could never show them who it was, of whom he spake so much, and so much honour. When Christ came to be baptized, the Holy Ghost had no sooner come upon him, but he was rapt away into the wilderness: and then John sends this honourable testimony after him, "This was he, of whom I spake," &c. But then it was too late for the people to observe who he was; for he was gone out of sight. Since that time till now, he had been in the wilderness among the beasts, and this is his first re-

vealing of himself among men again; and now it is seasonable and necessary for John to demonstrate him.

The title that he giveth him, “The Lamb of God,” plainly referreth to the lamb of the daily sacrifice; and it is so called, according to the common style and phrase, by which things devoted to God were expressed, as, ‘The bread of God^l’; ‘The night of the Lord^m’; ‘A Nazarite of Godⁿ’; ‘The candle of God^o.’ Now, that lamb was so familiar, common, and conspicuous a lecture of Christ, and it was the first conspicuous lecture of Christ that was in the world^p, that John could not have chosen an epithet that would speak him out better, than to use an expression from the morning and evening lamb, that was offered at Jerusalem. For, besides that, 1. John had had newly to deal with the priests and Levites, whose chief employment was about that lamb; and, 2. besides that it was about sacrifice time on the second day, when John useth these words, between three and four o’clock in the afternoon, ver. 39; and, besides that, 3. the lamb represented the innocency and purity of Christ, in his being without spot; and the death of Christ, in being offered up^q;—it was, 4. most proper and pertinent to the doctrine and preaching of John, which he had used before, to use now such an epithet for Christ, when he came in sight: for he had still spoken of ‘remission of sins,’ and ‘remission of sins,’ to all that had come to be baptized^r; a doctrine not usual among them, that stood upon their own righteousness and performance of the law: and, therefore, when Christ first appeareth, he, from an allusion to the daily lamb, upon whose head the sins of the people were confessed and laid, sheweth how remission of sins cometh indeed,—namely, by the sacrifice of this Lamb of God, Christ,—who should bear and take away the sins of the world,—as that lamb did, in figure, the sins of the Jews.

Ver. 31: “And I knew him not.”] The clause is spoken to, and explained, in the notes on Matt. iii. 14.

§ “But that he might be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing.”] The baptism of John did tend to the manifesting of Christ, especially, two ways:—1. Because, by the strangeness of his ministry, and the wonder

^l Lev. xxi. 21.

^m Exod. xii. 42.

ⁿ Judg. xiii. 5.

^o 1 Sam. iii. 3.

^p Rev. xiii. 8.

^q Σημαίνει τὸ πάθος διὰ τῆς ἀμενῶς προσήγορίας, Ignat. Mart. Epist. ad Tarsenses.

^r Mark, i. 4.

of such a baptism as his was, the eyes of all the people were drawn to look after what he meant by it. For, though his baptism, for the manner of it, was suitable to the baptism so well known among the Jews, as was observed before,—yet was the doctrine and end of it so strange to them, that it put the whole nation to an inquiry what was in it. And, 2. Then did John preach Christ [as ready to come], to every one that came to be baptized.

Ver. 39: “They came and saw where he dwelt.”] It is questionable, whether μένει here doth intimate his inn, or his habitation; but I rather understand the latter, and that the place was Capernaum; where Christ had a habitation, and was a member or citizen of that city. For, though he was a Nazarite in regard of his mother’s house and residence, yet it is very probable he was a Capernaite by his father, Joseph. For,

1. Observe that Capernaum is called “his own city^s.”
2. There he pays tribute, as the proper place where he should pay it^t.
3. When he is refused at Nazareth, his mother’s town, he goeth down to Capernaum, his father’s^u.
4. His resort to Capernaum was very frequent, and his abode there very much^v.
5. That his father and mother are very well known there^w.
6. That in regard of this frequency of Christ’s being in this town, and its interest in him as an inhabitant and member of it, Capernaum is said to be “lifted up to heaven.”

Now, Capernaum standing upon the banks of Jordan, and on the very point of the lake of Gennesaret, as Jordan began to spread itself into that lake,—he, and these disciples that go with him, pass over the water before they come thither; for now they were on the other side Jordan, where John baptized.

Ver. 40: “One of the two was Andrew, Simon Peter’s brother.”] Who the other was, it is uncertain and undeterminable: possibly it might be the evangelist John himself; but there is no fixing on him, or any other particular man: but this may be observed, that Peter was not the first that came in for a disciple to Christ, but his brother Andrew and

^s Matt. ix. 1, compared with Mark, ii. 1.

^t Matt. xvii. 24.

^u Luke, iv. 31.

^v John, ii. 11. Luke, iv. 31. John, vi. 17. Luke, x. 15.

^w John, vi. 42.

another. And it was well he was not the first, that so much of the Romanists' boastings may be stopped.

§ "We have found the Messias."] Andrew speaketh, 1. In reference to the expectation of the nation, that looked so much, and so earnestly, for the coming of Christ, and for his coming at this time. 2. In reference to the opinion of the nation, that held, that when Christ came, none should know whence he was*. And, 3. In reference to the common and constant testimony of John, that spake so much of Christ to come after him.

The word 'Messias' doth, solely and singularly, betoken 'Christ,' as it is interpreted most pertinently by the evangelist here, and chap. iv. 25. For, though the word משיח in Hebrew, in the Scripture, signifieth any 'anointed one,' whatsoever; yet, in this Greek form, Μεσσίας, it never signifieth but only Christ. Nor is the Hebrew word משיח used in Hebrew authors, but in the same sense; and so it is used infinitely among them: sometimes set single, without any other addition, and very often with this addition, מלך המשיח 'The King Messias;' as he that is never so little versed in Jewish authors, will find in great variety. In this propriety the word is used, Dan. ix. 25, 26; and so was it confessed by the ancient Jews, though the modern would elude it. The Jews of the Talmud age say, that "the end of the Messias was spoken of in the Book of Chetubim," aiming at this place; but how the latter generations turn off such a sense, see in R. Saadiah, and Rab. Solomon, in loc. &c.

Ver. 42: "Thou art Simon."] Christ nameth him at the first sight; and hereby sheweth, that he was the Messias, in that he could thus name Simon and his father, with whom he had had no converse before.

Simon, or Simeon, as the Syriac renders it [for they are all one, as Acts xv. 14], was a name that was exceeding much in use among the Jews at this time; as Matt. xxvii. 32; Mark, iii. 18; Luke, ii. 25; Acts, viii. 9, and xiii. 1, &c. And it was very frequent in use in their schools, in putting of cases,—as, "Reuben borrowed such a thing of Simeon," &c.

The Jews themselves seem to have brought the Hebrew word 'Simeon,' into this Greek manner of pronouncing, 'Simon;' for their own authors speak of one Rabbi Simon.

* John, vii. 27.

§ “The son of Jona.”] Bar Jona in the Syriac, Matt. xvi. 17; and Simon Jona in the Greek, John xxi. 15—17.

There are that conceive a corruption to be in the writing of this word; for (say they) it should be ‘Joanna.’ And of that mind is Jerome, the Vulgar Latin, Erasmus, at John xxi. 15; and of that writing is Erasmus’s Greek copy there, and some others here: but upon what ground this facile and most general reading, of ‘Jona’ [for so the Syrian, Arabic, most and best Greek copies, and most translations, utter it], should be forsaken, and one so far-fetched and strained as ‘Joanna’ be embraced, and taken for the right,—I cannot yet understand or apprehend.

Certainly, Jona is the genitive case of Jonas in the LXX, Jonah iv. 8; and in the New Testament, Matt. xii. 21. 39. And why the father of Peter, should not be thought to be Jonas, as well as Joannas, I believe it will be very hard to show a reason. We have mention of Rabbi Jona, among the Jewish doctors; which sheweth, that the name was given to others, besides the old prophet; and there is no reason, why a private man might not carry it as well as a doctor. Sure it is, that the very word ‘Jona,’ applied thus to Peter, doth give a very good hint, to compare him and the old prophet together: for they were both preachers to the Gentiles; both of them declined that employment; and both of them declined it at Joppa. Compare Jonah i, and Acts x.

§ “Thou shalt be called Cephas.”] I. Change of names in Scripture is frequent, and most common for the better, as Abram’s into Abraham, Jacob’s into Israel, Hoshea’s into Jehoshua, and Solomon’s into Jedidiah; though sometimes there is a change for the worse,—as Jerubbaal into Jerubesheth^y, Sychem into Sychar^z, &c.

II. Christ changeth the name of three disciples only,—Peter, James, and John^a; as God had changed the names of three men only in the Old Testament,—Abram, Jacob, and Solomon.

III. Now, as concerning the name Cephas, which Simon carried henceforward^b, it is a Syriac word, framed into an adjective, and into a Greek utterance, by addition of *s* in the latter end.

^y 2 Sam. xi. 21.

^z John, iv. 5.

^a Mark, iii. 16. 18.

^b 1 Cor. i. 12, and xv. 5. Gal. ii. 9.

‘Ceph,’ indeed, is used sometimes in the Hebrew^c; but ‘Cepha’ soundeth of the Chaldee idiom, and is used very frequently by the paraphrasts; most commonly, to render the Hebrew word סלע, as D. Kimchi noteth in Michol, and as may be observed in Num. xx. 8. 10, 11; Judg. xx. 45. 47, and xxi. 13; 1 Sam. xxiii. 28, and divers other places: and sometime to express the word לשון when it signifieth, ‘a point of land,’ or ‘sea;’ as Josh. xv. 2, חלשון הפנה נגנה the Chaldee renders it, כיפא דמתפנו לדרומא: meaning, as saith Kimchi on the place, ‘the point of a rock that looked south-east.’ But it will easily be agreed upon, about the signification of Ceph and Cepha, namely, that it denoteth a ‘rock,’ in the most proper and most common meaning of it: but the scruple is, whether ‘Cephas,’ be the very same with ‘Cepha,’ in signification, yea, or no; and whether the letter s, added in the end, do change the sound of it only, and not the sense.

To me it seemeth, that ‘Cephas’ is of an adjective signification, and betokeneth not ‘a rock,’ but ‘rocky;’ not ‘petra,’ but ‘petrosus,’ or ‘belonging to the rock:’ and I am induced to this opinion, upon these grounds and arguments:—

1. Because it is uttered ‘Cephas,’ and not ‘Cepha;’ for although it is ordinary with the language of the New Testament, to add s in the latter end of some words, to make them sound of a Greek pronunciation, as Hezekias, Manasses, Messias, Barnabas, &c; and though I think it doth so here,—yet do I not conceive, it doth so here for that end only, but for some other farther purpose and intent.

As, 1. To mark it for a proper name, and to take it off from being taken otherwise: and so Barnabas, Barsabas, and Elymas, are marked with the same mark, for the same end.

2. To change its sense, as well as its nature, and to alter it from a substantive signification, to an adjective, as well as from a common noun to a proper. For, as the evangelist maketh a clear distinction between Πέτρος and Πέτρα, Matt. xvi. 18, as all orthodox expositors upon that place grant; so, certainly, is the like to be made betwixt Cephas and Cepha; for these Syriac words our Saviour used, when he uttered that speech.

^c As Jer. iv. 29. Job, xxx. 6.

And to this purpose it is also to be observed, that the word Πέτρος, is not used for a ‘rock’ in all the Scripture: it is in use, indeed, in that sense among heathen authors, but in the LXX, and in all the New Testament, it is scarcely to be so found. Now, if the evangelist meant to tell us, that ‘Cephas’ signifieth a ‘rock,’ it is wonder, that he would use the word Πέτρος, which never occurreth in that sense in all the Bible,—and refuse the word Πέτρα, which signifieth so in the Scripture hundreds of times; nay, say some of our Greek dictionaries, Πέτρα κοινῶς, Πέτρος ἀττικῶς: Πέτρα is the common name for a ‘rock,’ even in the heathen Greek language; but Πέτρος, is but the Attic dialect. And, therefore, I cannot but wonder, that Petrus, in this place, should be translated Petra, as Beza in Latin, and Brucioli in Italian, render it; and our English to the same sense, “Thou shalt be called Cephas; which is, by interpretation, a stone.”

For the taking up, therefore, of the sense and meaning, and of the reason and occasion of this name given to Simon, these particulars are to be taken into consideration:—

I. That Christ called him Cephas, ‘totidem literis,’ and not Cepha: and that he was commonly so called among the disciples, Cephas, with the s sounded in the latter end. I know it is a common opinion to the contrary, as Beza, on Matt. xvi. 18, utters it; “Dominus, Syriace loquens, nulla usus est agnominatione, sed utrobique dixit Cepha:” and accordingly, the Syriac translator every where expresseth it.

But let it be observed, 1. That, as the Jewish nation was full of Greek names, which were Greek names indeed, as Andreas, Nicodemus, Alexander, &c: so did they frame many of their Jewish names, which were Jewish names indeed, into a Greek pronunciation, and so pronounced them among themselves,—as Theudas, Baithus, and others, in the Talmud; and Heraudes for Herod, in the Syriac translator, &c. And why Cephas should not be so used among them, and other Greek-sounding Syriac names in the New Testament, I have not yet met with any reason that giveth any satisfaction, nor, indeed, with any author that giveth any reason.

And let it be observed, 2. That whereas, generally, common nouns in the Syriac tongue, do end in *a*, as Aceldama, Abba, Gabbitha, Talitha^d; when they are to be framed into

^d Acts, i. 19. Gal. iv. 6. John, xix. 13. Mark, v. 41.

proper names of men, it is done by putting *s* to the end of them,—as Barabbas, Elymas, Barnabas, &c. And of the same nature is Cephas here. Now, since this change of nouns, from common to proper, was made among the Jews,—what reason can be given, why this letter, that made the change, should not be reserved among the Jews also? Did the Greeks only call Simon ‘Cephas,’ and not the Jews? and did the Greeks call the other men ‘Barnabas’ and ‘Barabbas,’ but the Jews ‘Barnaba’ and ‘Barabba’?

Consider, 3. How common the Greek Bible, or the LXX, was in use among the Jews at this time, and how much mixture of Greek words was used in their common language at this time, as appeareth by the Syriac translator, the Chaldee paraphrasts, the Talmuds, and others the most ancient Jewish writers; and then we have good cause to think, that they that used the whole Bible in Greek, and that used to speak so much Greek mingled with their Syriac language continually, would not stick to utter one letter that sounded of the Greek, when that letter was only and properly added, to denote a proper name.

But you will say, that ‘the New Testament writeth, Hezekias, Josias, Jonas, and the like, with *s* in the end, as these words are written: and yet there is none, that can think that the Jews uttered those words so, but as they are written in the Old Testament, Hezekiah, Josiah, Jonah.’ It is true, that it is most like they did so; but the difference betwixt them and these words, that we have in hand, is so apparent, that it is hardly needful to show it: those were proper names originally,—these were common names made proper: those had *s* added in the end, not to show that they were proper names, but to supply the Hebrew *h* or *ן*, which the Greek, in the end of a word, cannot utter; but these have *s* added in the latter end, purposely and intentionally, to make them proper names, and to show that they are so.

And, 4. Let it be observed, how it could be possible for the disciples, in those words of our Saviour, “Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram” [Matt. xvi. 18], to understand them otherwise, than that Peter should be called ‘the rock,’ if Christ used Cepha in both places: “Thou art Cepha, and upon this Cepha;—Thou art a rock, and upon this rock will I build my church:” let any one but judge what interpretation they could make of it, by his own construing and in-

interpreting it, according to the propriety, as the words lie before him. Therefore, it is more than probable, that Christ called his name ‘Cephas,’ uttering and sounding the *s* in the latter end; and that the addition of that letter, was not from the evangelist, but from Christ himself; and that in the speech mentioned, he thus differenced the words, “Thou art Cephas, and upon this Cepha will I build my church.”

II. Now the reason why our Saviour giveth him this name ‘Cephas’ or ‘Rocky,’ was not so much for that he was built upon the rock, for so were all the rest of the apostles, except Judas; but because he had a special work to do about that building, which Christ was to found upon the rock. For in those words, “upon this rock will I build my church,” he meaneth the church of the Gentiles, which was now in founding: and in that building, Peter had this special and singular work and privilege, that he was the first that preached the gospel to the Gentiles^e.

§ “Which is, by interpretation, Peter.”] For so should the word be rendered, and not as our English hath it, “which is, by interpretation, *a stone*.” This is a passage like that in the verse preceding,—“Messias, which is, by interpretation, Christ;” and that, Acts ix. 39, “Tabitha, which is, by interpretation, Dorcas;” where our translators have very properly observed and followed the intention of the evangelists; which is, to give these proper names out of one language into another, and not to give them out of proper names into common nouns. And here they should have followed the same course which they have done in the margin, but have refused it in the text. The Arabic, and Vulgar Latin, and divers others, translate it ‘Petrus,’ according to our sense; but the Syriac translateth not the clause at all.

Ver. 43: “The day following.”] Jansenius dare not suppose this to be the next day after that Andrew and the other disciple followed Jesus to his own home; but he thinks it was the day after Christ had named Simon ‘Cephas.’ The cause of his doubting is this; because, it being late towards night, when Jesus and Andrew, and the other disciple, came to the place where Jesus dwelt, ver. 39,—he cannot suppose, how Peter should be found and

^e Acts, x; and xv. 7.

brought to Christ before the next day; and yet he confesseth Epiphanius to be of opinion against him. But it being observed, that Peter and Andrew were brethren, that they dwelt together^f, that they fished together^g,—it will be no difficulty to conceive, how Andrew might find out Peter upon a sudden, and bring him to Jesus that very night that they came into Capernaum, though it were late; and, accordingly, there is no scruple to expound this ‘day following,’ of the very next day after.

Ver. 44: “Bethsaida.”] This was a town that stood beside the lake of Gennesaret, changed by Philip the tetrarch into the form or state of a city, and named by him ‘Julia,’ after the name of Cæsar’s daughter. So Josephus witnesseth^h; *Κώμην δὲ Βηθσαϊδὰν, πρὸς λίμνην δὲ τῇ Γεννησαρίτιδι, πόλεως παρασχὼν ἀξίωμα, πλήθει τε οἰκητόρων, καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ δυνάμει, Ἰουλίᾳ θυγατρὶ τῇ Καίσαρος ὁμώνυμον ἐκάλεσεν.* “The town Bethsaida, by the lake of Gennesaret, he brought to the dignity of a city, both in multitude of inhabitants, and in other strength, and called it after the name of Julia, the daughter of Cæsar.”

Bethsaida signifieth the ‘house,’ or ‘place of hunting;’ and it seemeth to have been so called, because it stood in a place, where was store of deer or venison. And to this sense is that passage of Jacob to be understood, Gen. xlix. 21; “Naphtali, a hind let loose;” that is, Naphtali shall abound in venison, as Asher with bread and oil (ver. 20), and Judah with wine (ver. 11). View the places in the original. Now Bethsaida stood, either in, or very near, the tribe of Naphtali, as shall be showed elsewhere.

§ “The city of Andrew and Peter.”] Andrew and Peter, after this, removed and dwelt in Capernaumⁱ, because they would be near Christ, whose residence was there, as was observed before. And there Peter pays tribute for himself, as in proper place^k.

§ “We have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write,” &c.] Not to insist upon the studiousness of Philip and Nathanael in the law and prophets, as some collect it out of this expression; there are these things most observable out of these words:—1. That the whole Scriptures of the Old Testament are comprehended

^f Mark, i. 29.

^g Matt. iv. 18, &c.

^h Antiq. lib. 18. cap. 3.

ⁱ Mark, i. 21. 29.

^k Matt. xvii. 27.

under these two heads, 'the law and the prophets.' And so again, Matt. xi. 13; Luke xvi. 29. For though, indeed, the law and the prophets only were read in the synagogues every sabbath-day¹, yet the third part of the Old Testament, called כתובים, or 'Hagiographa,' did prophesy of Christ, as well as the other two; and so must, of necessity, be included here. For what book of Scriptures is more full of prophecies of Christ, than the Book of Psalms? and what hath more clear prediction concerning Christ, than the Book of Daniel? And yet, neither of these is taken in among the books of the prophets, as the Jews did commonly divide them in their Bibles, and read them in their synagogues; but they come under the third part, כתובים. And, therefore, as by 'the law' here, is to be understood all the Books of Moses,—so, by 'the prophets,' is to be understood all the Old Testament beside. And so, what is spoken in a Psalm, is said to be spoken by a prophet, Matt. xiii. 35; and Daniel is called a prophet, Matt. xxiv. 13. And so the penmen of the Books of Job, Esther, Chronicles, &c. deserve the same name. And this very consideration were argument enough, if there were no more, to plead Solomon's salvation.

2. That Christ is the general and chief subject of the law and the prophets. And here are we got into a very large field, if we would but traverse it, to show how law and prophets, in types and prophecies, did speak before of Christ; but this consideration, and particulars of it, will be continually occurring and emerging as we go along.

3. That when Nathanael saith, That "we have found him, of whom Moses and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth," he meaneth not, that either Moses or the prophets had so articulately named him,—but that Jesus of Nazareth proved to be he, of whom they had written and spoken so much.

Ver. 46: "Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?" This seemeth to be spoken by Nathanael, not only as referring to the poorness and obscurity of the city Nazareth [as that it is neither mentioned by the prophets to be a producer of any good, nor likely in itself to be so, being a place of an inferior and contemptible rank], but as referring

¹ As Acts, xiii. 15.

rather to the wickedness and profaneness of the place ; that it was so wretched and ungodly a city, that it was unlikely that any good thing should come out of it. The wickedness of the people of this place appeareth Luke iv. 29, when they are so desperate, as to go about to murder Christ at his first appearing among them.

Ver. 47 ; compare Jer. ix. 4—6 : “ Behold an Israelite indeed,” &c.] Although this be the character of every true Christian^m, and it be accordingly conceived almost generally by expositors, that our Saviour aimeth only at such a thing here ; namely, that ‘ this is one that serveth God sincerely, and with a good heart ; and this is such a one as God requireth a man to be in the profession of religion,’—yet can I not apprehend this to be the sole and proper meaning and intention of these words ; for why might not the same have been spoken of, and to, Peter, Andrew, and Philip ? Certainly, they were very sincere and upright towards God, and were Israelites indeed, without guile or hypocrisy in matter of religion, as well as Nathanael ; their fetching one another to Christ, and the readiness of them all in embracing of Christ, confirmeth this past all denial : and it is hard and harsh, to think that Christ should give that for a singular encomium to Nathanael, which might generally be given to any of his disciples. When he nameth Simon Peter, it was for some singular and peculiar respect ; and so when he nameth James and John, ‘ Boanerges :’ and, doubtless, when he passeth such a character as this upon Nathanael, it was for some regard and respect, in which he was differenced from other men.

The cause and occasion, therefore, of this description of him by our Saviour, I conceive rather to be Nathanael’s uprightness and deceitlessness towards men, than towards God ; though his uprightness and sincerity towards God is by no means to be denied. And it seemeth, that this was a common name and title, which Nathanael had got among his neighbours, and those that knew him, for his very honest, upright, and exemplary dealing, converse, and integrity, amongst them, that he was commonly called ‘ the guileless Israelite ;’ as that Roman was called ‘ verissimus,’ for his exceeding great truthfulness. And truly, to me, it is very pro-

^m As Isa. lxxv. 8.

bable, that the great variety of names that we find divers men in Scripture to have had [as some to have two names, some three, some more], proceeded, in very many of them, from this very cause and occasion,—namely, their neighbours and acquaintance, observing some singular quality in them, and action done by them, gave them some denomination or other agreeable to that action or quality. So Gideon came by his name Jerubbaalⁿ, and Jerubbesheth^o; so Shemaiah, the false prophet, came to be called the ‘Nehelamite,’ or ‘the dreamer^p;’ and divers others mentioned in Scripture, and in Josephus, some of which will be taken up in their due places. Now, it being a common title that Nathanael had got among all that knew him, to be called the ‘Israelite without guile;’ our Saviour, when he sees him come towards him, calls him by the same name; and, thereupon, Nathanael questions him, how he came to know him, that he could so directly hit upon his common denomination.

Ver. 48: “When thou wast under the fig-tree, I saw thee.”] This seemeth to refer, not only to his being under the fig-tree, but to some private and secret action that he did there; and for which he went thither. And, as our Saviour convinceth the woman of Samaria, that he was the Messias, by telling her of her evil actions, that she did in the dark and secret,—so doth he Nathanael, by hinting some good things that he did from the eyes of men, under a fig-tree, before Philip light on him there,—as praying, vowing, or some other action, which none knew of but himself. And this appeareth rather to be the matter that Christ aimed at; and that worketh in Nathanael for his conviction; because that it was possible, that Christ might have been near the fig-tree himself, as well as Philip; and he might see Nathanael, and Nathanael not see him; and so might Nathanael have supposed: but when he telleth of some secret action that passed from him under the fig-tree, which his conscience told him, that no mortal eye could be conscious to but himself,—then he cries out, “Thou art the Son of God,” &c.

Ver. 49: “Thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel.”] This he speaketh from 2 Sam. vii. 14; Psal. ii. 6, 7; and Psal. lxxxix. 26, 27; where God setteth his own and only-begotten Son upon his hill of Zion, and throne of David, and to rule “over the house of Jacob for ever^q.”

ⁿ Judg. vi. 32.^o 2 Sam. xi. 21.^p Jer. xxix. 31.^q Luke, i. 33.

Ver. 51: "Verily, verily, I say unto you."] In the Greek it is ἀμὴν, ἀμήν. Now, because this manner of expression is exceeding usual in the speeches of our Saviour through the gospel, sometimes single Amen, as in the rest of the evangelists, and constantly doubled in John, Amen, Amen; and because this is the first place, according to our harmony-order and method, that we meet with the word at all; it will be pertinent here to take up the meaning of it once for all, and to consider these two particulars concerning it:—1. What our Saviour doth properly intend and mean by 'Amen,' when he useth it so oft: and, 2. Why John the evangelist doth constantly use it doubled, when the other three never use it so at all.

1. As to the first, it is to be observed, and that is well enough known, that the word 'Amen,' is a Hebrew word, and is very commonly used in the Old Testament; but this withal is to be observed [which, it may be, is not so commonly noted], that it is never used in the Old Testament, but by way of wishing or apprecation (the sixteenth verse of Isaiah lxv only excepted, of which anon): as, when it cometh single, as Deut. xxvii, twelve times over, where the LXX render it Γένοιτο, 'be it done:' 1 Kings i. 36, where the LXX have it Γένοιτο οὕτως, 'so be it:' Neh. v. 13; Jer. xxviii. 6; Psal. cvi. 48, &c. Or when it cometh double, Num. v. 22; Psal. xli. 13; lxxii. 19; and lxxxix. 52, which the LXX express Γένοιτο, Γένοιτο, 'be it done, be it done,' or 'so be it, so be it.' In all these places it is used by way of prayer or imprecation, according as the subject-matter was to which it was applied; as David Kimchi expresseth it in Michol, in the root אמן: "It is spoken (saith he) על דרך תפלה או הוא על דרך קבלה שקבלו על עצמם הקללת אם עכו"ר either by way of prayer, or by way of undertaking; as that they take upon them a curse, if they transgress."

But, in these utterances of our Saviour, the sense of it is altered from precatory, to assertory,—or from the way of wishing, to the way of affirming: for what one evangelist expresseth, "Amen, I say unto you, This poor widow," &c; another uttereth, Ἀληθῶς λέγω, "Of a truth I say unto you," &c. Matthew saith, "Amen, I say unto you, That some that stand here," &c; which Luke^t giveth, Λέγω ἀληθῶς, "Of a truth I say unto you." So Ἀμὴν, in Matt. xxiii. 36,

^r Mark, xii. 43. ^s Luke, xxi. 2. ^t Chap. ix. 27.

is rendered *Nai*, ‘truly,’ Luke xi. 51, &c. For, indeed, the word ‘Amen’ doth properly betoken and signify ‘truth,’ as is apparent by the construction of that verse fore-mentioned, Isa. lxxv. 16; “He who blesseth himself in the earth, shall bless himself *באלהי אמן* in the God of truth: and he that sweareth in the earth, shall swear *באלהי אמן* by the God of truth:” as not only our English, but also R. Solomon and David Kimchi do well render it; and the gloss of Kimchi upon the place is worth the citing;—“He saith in the earth (saith he), because in all the world there shall be one truth, and that shall be the truth of *אלהי אמן* the God of truth.”

Now Christ is called ‘Amen,’ as being not only ‘the faithful and true witness,’—but even he, “in whom all the promises of God are yea and Amen,” and even ‘truth’ itself.

Therefore, when he cometh to publish the gospel, which is that one truth that should be in all the world (for the prophet Isaiah speaketh there apparently concerning the times of the gospel), he speaketh of his own (as, he saith, the devil doth, when he speaketh a lie^w), and useth a different style from the prophets (which used to authorize their truths with, Thus saith the Lord), and speaketh *αὐτοπίστως*, upon his own authority, as the God of truth: “Amen, I say unto you.” In this word, therefore, is included two things; namely, ‘the truth spoken,’ and ‘the truth speaking it;’ and the expression doth not only import the certainty of the things delivered, but also recalleth to consider, that he that delivers it, is *אלהי אמן* ‘Amen the God of truth, and truth itself.’ And this consideration will help to give a resolution to the second scruple that was proposed; and that is, why John alone doth use the word doubled, and none other of the evangelists.

I am but little satisfied with that gloss, that is given by some upon this matter,—namely, that John doth constantly double this word, because the matters, spoken by him, are of a more celestial and sublime strain, than the matters spoken by the other evangelists,—and, therefore, the greater attention is challenged to them by this gemination; for neither can I see, nor dare I think of, any such superiority and inferiority in the writings of the evangelists.

^u Rev. xiii. 14.

^v 2 Cor. i. 20.

^w John, viii. 44.

Nor do I suppose, that Christ used this gemination himself (for it is very strange that in those speeches that this evangelist mentioneth, he should do so, and in the speeches that the others mention, he should not do so, when, it may be, sometimes, it was the very same speech); but I conceive that the evangelist hath doubled the word, that he might express the double sense, which the single word in our Saviour's mouth, and in the other evangelists, includeth. And so he addeth nothing to what Christ spake, but explaineth his speech to the utmost extent. He saith in the other evangelists 'Amen' singly; but he meaneth thus doubly, "This is truth, and I am truth that speak it." Now John, that he might clear this double meaning, doth double the word Amen, Amen; the one whereof doth refer to the thing that is spoken, and the other to the person that speaketh it. But the question proposed is not yet resolved, why John should do thus, rather than any of the others: but the same answer that resolveth why John should relate so many things that none of the other three do ever mention, will resolve this;—namely, that it was God's will and disposal that there should be four that should write the gospel,—and that some writing one thing, and some another,—some after one manner, some another,—the story should be divinely made up to its full perfection. Now John wrote last, and he had warrant and opportunity to relate what the others had omitted. And as for the particular in hand, he saw that the other had only produced this word single, as Christ indeed had continually uttered it, and that they had some of them expounded it in a place or two, 'Αληθῶς and Ναὶ, to show that it was to be taken in these speeches in a meaning different from that precatory strain, in which it was constantly used in the Old Testament: but yet that there was something more included in the word; and therefore he is warranted by the Holy Ghost to explain it to the full in two words, Amen, Amen. And thus the counsels of the Lord of old, uttered and revealed by the prophets, do, in the preaching of the gospel by our Saviour, prove אֱמֻנָה אֱמֻנָה "truth, truth*."

§ "Hereafter ye shall see heaven opened."] Observe the manner of our Saviour's answer; the text saith, he saith *to him*, but his words are aimed at them all, "Amen, Amen, I say *to you*, Ye shall see," &c. He applieth his speech to all

* Isa. xxv. 1.

in general, though he spake more singularly (as the text telleth) to Nathanael, in prosecution of the discourse, that had been betwixt them before.

Now the main difficulty of this speech lieth in this,—in what sense to understand, ‘the opening of the heavens;’ and where and how these disciples saw the ‘angels ascending and descending upon Christ.’ The words are capable of a double construction; and some give them the one, and some the other: some understand them literally, that the disciples did, at some times, see the heavens opened indeed, as John the Baptist had done^y, and the angels ascending and descending upon Christ indeed, though never a one of the evangelists mention it. And fair arguments and probability they show for this, which I shall not spend time to mention.

But others conceive the words are to be interpreted in a metaphorical and borrowed sense, and not according to the letter; and so taken, some interpret them one way, some another.

I confess that I have stood at this place, ‘*tanquam in bivio*,’ a very long time, and can hardly tell which way to take; both the interpretations of the thing, both the literal and the tropical, carrying so fair a colour and appearance with them. But I cannot but incline to the latter,—namely, to conceive that Christ here speaketh in a borrowed sense; and, by the ‘opening of heaven,’ and the ‘ascending and descending of angels,’ that he meaneth not historically, that that very thing was to be done, but mystically meaneth something else, which he thought good to express by these borrowed phrases. And that which mainly swayeth me that way [besides the silence of all the evangelists, that never mention such a thing really done] is the force and signification of the word ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ. Our English and Erasmus render it ‘hereafter;’ and so have left the time at a very large and uncertain scantling. But the Syriac and the Vulgar render it, ‘from this time,’ or ‘henceforward,’ and so it most properly and naturally meaneth: for it signifieth, not only a date of time, and some one action done after that date, at a time uncertain; but a continuance of such actions or things from that date forward.

Now our Saviour’s meaning in this phrase is, that from

^y Luke, iii.

this very time forward, he would declare and show himself in his ministry gloriously, and with power, and henceforward should his disciples see and perceive so much by glorious demonstrations of him, that they might know that he was the Christ.

His expressions of ‘the heavens opened,’ and the ‘angels ascending and descending,’ refer and allude to Ezekiel’s vision at Chebar^z, and to Jacob’s at Beth-el^a; two as glorious revelations of Christ, as any vision the Old Testament mentioneth.

His meaning may be given in a paraphrase, thus; “Nathanael, dost thou think it so great a matter, that I could see thee, though thou wert so close, and private, and secret, under the fig-tree? Thou shalt see far greater things than these: for I tell you all; From this time forward I must begin to preach the gospel; and ye shall perceive that I have such knowledge of things, as if heaven itself were open to me; and such power of miracles and doing wonders, as if the angels were continually going on errands for me, and doing my will.” And, accordingly, the evangelist relateth, that, on the very next day, he showed a miracle at Cana in Galilee, and ‘manifested forth his glory:’ and, in the latter end of the same chapter, he speaketh of his miracles at Jerusalem, and his knowledge of all men, ver. 24.

So that henceforth Christ’s ministry in preaching and doing miracles doth begin; the place, Cana; the time, some two months after his baptism, or thereabouts, for aught is to be perceived from the evangelists to the contrary.

§ “The Son of man.”] This title of Christ, which is so frequent in the evangelists [and yet, which is observable, never but in his own words], meaneth not only to express ‘a man,’ according to the Syrian dialect then used, **בַּר נִשְׂא** Bar nosho; nor only to express Christ’s humanity, or that he was truly man, in all things like unto us, sin only excepted; nor doth it only intimate his humility, when he doth not disdain to call himself so oft by this humble name, though it may have some aim at all these things:—but it seemeth to be used so oft by our Saviour concerning himself, as intimating him to be ‘the second Adam,’ and referring to that promise that was made to Adam instantly

^z Ezek. i. 1.

^a Gen. xxiii.

after his fall, ‘of the seed of the woman, that should break the serpent’s head.’ And to this very purpose, as we observed in its place, the evangelist Luke, at the story of his baptism, when he was to be installed into his ministry, and had that glorious testimony from heaven,—deriveth his pedigree up to the first Adam, to draw all men’s eyes to that first promise, and to cause them to own him for that seed there promised, and for that effect that is there mentioned, of dissolving the works of Satan. And as that evangelist giveth that hint, when he is now entering this quarrel with Satan, even in the entrance of his ministry,—so doth he himself, as he goeth along in it, very frequently and commonly, by this very phrase, give the same intimation for the same purpose. Nathanael had proclaimed him ‘the Son of God;’ he instantly titles himself, ‘the Son of man,’—not only to show his humanity [for that Nathanael was assured of by the words of Philip, who calls him, ‘Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph’], but to resolve the thoughts of the hearers to the first promise, and to lead them to look for restoring of that by this second Adam, which was lost in the first. “To him was heaven shut upon his fall, and he lost his former converse and attendance of angels, but ‘ye shall see heaven open, and the angels ascending and descending upon the Son of man,’ that you may know, that the second Adam is here.”

It is true, indeed, that Ezekiel^b and Daniel^c are called, either of them, son of man; and that all men in general are called^d the “sons of man,” בְּנֵי אָדָם as ‘nomen naturæ;’ and so we deny not but this title doth denote and show Christ’s humanity, and may tell us to what honour God raised our nature in him. But when he doth often style himself by the title with such an emphasis, it draws the eyes and the thoughts of all to meditate also and consider upon this farther thing.

SECTION XIII.

Christ’s first Miracle, changing of Forms. His first Passover.

JOHN, II.

Ver. 1. AND, the third day [*a*], there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee [*b*]; and the mother of Jesus was there.

^b Chap. ii. 1.

^c Chap. viii. 17.

^d Psal. lxii. 9.

2. And both Jesus was called, and his disciples, to the marriage [c].

3. And when they wanted wine [d], the mother of Jesus saith unto him, 'They have no wine.'

4. Jesus saith unto her, 'Woman, what have I to do with thee? mine hour is not yet come.'

5. His mother saith unto the servants, 'Whatsoever he saith unto you, do it.'

6. And there were set there six water-pots [e] of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing two or three firkins [f] a piece.

7. Jesus saith unto them, 'Fill the water-pots with water:' and they filled them up to the brim.

8. And he saith unto them, 'Draw out now, and bear unto the governor of the feast [g].' And they bare it.

9. When the ruler of the feast had tasted the water that was made wine, and knew not whence it was (but the servants which drew the water knew), the governor of the feast called the bridegroom,

10. And saith unto him, 'Every man, at the beginning, doth set forth good wine; and, when men have well drunk, then that which is worse; but thou hast kept the good wine until now.'

11. This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth his glory, and his disciples believed on him.

12. After this he went down to Capernaum [h], he and his mother, and his brethren, and his disciples; and they continued there not many days.

Christ's first Passover after his Baptism.

13. And the Jews' Passover was at hand, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem;

14. And found in the temple those, that sold oxen, and sheep, and doves, and the changers of money sitting.

15. And when he had made a scourge of small cords, he drove them all out of the temple, and the sheep and the oxen, and poured out the changers' money, and overthrew the tables:

16. And said unto them that sold doves, 'Take these things hence; make not my Father's house a house of merchandise.'

17. And his disciples remembered that it was written, 'The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up.'

18. Then answered the Jews, and said unto him, 'What sign showest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest these things?'

19. Jesus answered and said unto them, 'Destroy this temple; and, in three days, I will raise it up.'

20. Then said the Jews, 'Forty-and-six years was this temple in building [i], and wilt thou rear it up in three days?'

21. But he spake of the temple of his body.

22. When, therefore, he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them: and they believed the Scripture, and the word which Jesus had said.

23. Now when he was in Jerusalem at the Passover, in the feast-day, many believed in his name, when they saw the miracles which he did.

24. But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men;

25. And needed not that any should testify of man; for he knew what was in man.

[a] "The third day."] There is much difference whence to date this day; whether from John's last testimony of Christ, or from Christ's coming into Galilee, or from his conference with Nathanael. And this difficulty hath the rather risen, because this is another chapter: for certainly if this verse had been in the chapter before, they that date this third day, from Christ's coming into Galilee, would more readily have inclined to another date,—namely, from the testimony of John. And, truly, for all it is a new chapter, yet I see not why it should not be linked to that chain of time, that is in the chapter before. Now there it is said, John stood, and two of his disciples, and he testified of Jesus, and they followed him. And, 'the day following, Jesus would go into Galilee,' and meeteth with Philip and Nathanael: 'and, the third day, there was a marriage:'—what doubt can there be of those three days thus linked together? especially it being considered, that the Holy Ghost doth here date the time of Christ's first acting and moving in the ministry of the gospel, and will show how soon he wrought miracles after he began.

[b] The Syriac readeth, ‘in Catna of Galilee;’ and so doth it again, chap. iv. 6, and xxi. 2. And so doth the Hebrew map of Canaan mention קטנא בגליל ‘Catna in Galilee:’ for into this name, it seems, it was grown in after-times; and the Syrian calleth it by the name it bare in his time: as we find it common with the Chaldee paraphrast to do by names of places in the Old Testament,—as he calleth Kadesh-barnea, constantly, Reham; he calleth Argob, Trachona, or Trachonitis, Deut. iii. 4; and so might be instanced in exceeding many.

[c] Syriac, משתותא i. e. ‘the marriage-feast:’ for a feast ever attended a marriage; see Gen. xxix. 22; Judg. xiv. 10.

[d] Ὑστερήσαντος οἴνου:] Some, by the tense, would collect, that the wine was but now failing, and was not utterly spent; and, upon this collection, would interpret those words, ‘mine hour is not yet come,’ to this sense,—that Christ would not work the miracle, till the wine was clean gone. But neither is the tense of so strict a signification, nor are those words of such a meaning; as might be showed at large for the former, and shall be touched upon for the latter by and by: see those instances about the tense, Matt. xxvi. 26, εὐλογήσας ἔκλασε. 27, εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκε. 30, ὑμνήσαντες ἐξῆλθον: which, to spare more, do clearly intimate the action past; as Christ brake not the bread, nor gave the cup, while he was blessing and giving thanks, but after, &c.

[e] “Hydriæ.”] The same word is used by this same evangelist, chap. iv. 28. And the very notation of the word in this place, conduceth to the heightening of the miracle, and the confirming of the truth of it; for these vessels were ‘Hydriæ,’ ‘water-vessels,’ destined and used only for holding of water; and, therefore, no bottom or dregs of wine could be conceived in them, as by which some colour or taste might be given to the water to resemble wine. The vessels, which women used to fetch water in from the wells, were also called ‘Hydriæ,’ as is apparent by the place lately alleged, John iv. 28. These in Hebrew were called כדים^e, which the three Targums express by three several words, מודבא לגינא קולתא; but those vessels were either earthen, or wooden, or of leather, or some such light and portable matter; but these, here spoken of, were of stone, because they

^e Gen. xxiv. 14.

were not to be carried from place to place, but stood constantly in their dining-rooms, or thereabouts, to have water ready for them to wash, against they came to meat.

[f] Μετρητάς.] The LXX render three Hebrew words by this; 1. מֶדֶה in 1 Kings, xviii. 32; where it is said, Elias made a trench that would contain מֶדֶה two measures of seed: the Greek hath it, δύο μετρητάς. 2. בַּת in 2 Chron. iv. 5; Solomon's brazen sea held three thousand baths מֶדֶה: the LXX have it, μετρητάς τρισχιλίους. 3. פֹּרֶה in Hag. ii. 16; ἐξαντλήσαι πεντήκοντα μετρητάς: where either they take פֹּרֶה for 'a measure,' which, indeed, signifieth 'a wine-press;' or else they express the measure, which the Hebrew hath understood. What this measure μετρητῆς contained, shall be examined in the explanation of the verse.

[g] Ἀρχιτρικλινος.] There are three words couched and compacted in this one, and every one of the three refers and draws us to look upon three several things of the customs and fashions of those times;—1. Κλίνος from κλίνη, 'a bed,' because it was their manner of old, to sit upon beds as they sat at meat; "The king returned to the place at the banquet of wine, and Haman was fallen upon the bed, where Esther was^f." Ἀνεπαύετο ἐν κλινῇ, ἐν ἣπερ ἐδέειπνε τῇ ἐμοῦ ἐχομένῃ^g. "He rested on the bed on which he had supped, which was near to mine." 2. Τρίκλινος; it intimateth 'three beds;' for that was the common number that they had in their dining-rooms, and from whence that room was commonly called by the Latins, 'Triclinium,' or 'the room with three beds.' But of these things they speak at large, that write of the Jewish and the Roman antiquities, whither the reader is referred. And, 3. As for the Ἀρχι-*triclinus*, or governor of the feast,—who he was, shall be seen anon.

[h] Josephus calleth this town 'Cepharnome.' For, in his relation of his own life, he tells, that he had a fall from his horse, and got a bruise, and "was carried into the town called Cepharnome;" ἐκομίσθην εἰς κώμην Κεφαρνώμην λεγομένην.

Now this proper name is compounded of two words, 'Cephar' and 'Naum.' Now, that 'Cephar' signifieth 'a village,' it is undoubted, for the word occurreth several times in that sense in the Old Testament^h. But whether the

^f Esth. vii. 8.

^g Plat. in Sympos.

^h 1 Sam. vi. 18. 1 Chron. xxvii. 28. Neh. vi. 2, &c.

latter word 'Naum' were written נָעוּם or נָחוּם, is some doubtfulness. The Hebrew map of Canaan writes it כְּפָר נָחוּם 'the town of Nahum,' or 'the town of Consolation;' which name suited very well with it, now when Christ had his habitation in it. But it is commonly supposed, that it was called כְּפָר נָחוּם or, 'the town of Beauty,' because of the pleasant situation of it on the banks of Gennesaret, and because of the beauty of the buildings of the town itself.

[i] Ὁκοδομήθη.] This word may be construed two ways; either 'was in building,' or 'hath been built.' And there may be some doubtfulness whether way to fix the construction, in regard of the doubtfulness of whether temple the Jews speak here; whether of that that was built by Zorobabel upon the return of the people of the Jews out of captivity, or that that was built by Herod the Great. When we come to explain the verse, it will appear how fairly the word may be construed and understood either the one way or the other, and how fitly; in these several constructions, it may be applied to these several temples, that have been mentioned: and there, if we can, we will fix it to its proper meaning, and to the Jews' meaning and intention in these words.

Reason of the Order.

There need not any words, nor much pains, to confirm the order and connexion of this chapter with that that went before, nor the conjunction of these stories of this chapter one to another. For the words, 'on the third day,' used in the very front of the chapter, do so plainly tie it to the preceding, that there needeth no more to be said of it. And the transition of the story from Cana to Capernaum, and from Capernaum to the Passover at Jerusalem, is so clear, that he that runneth, may read the connexion, and none can make any doubt or scruple at all of it: only when it is said in ver. 12, "After this, he went down to Capernaum," it is to be understood, with some stay made before in Galilee, as shall be showed at the explanation of the verse.

HARMONY AND EXPLANATION.

Ver. 1.] Not to be too curious in finding out reasons, why Christ should work his first miracle at a marriage, and why by transforming water into wine, about which business some expositors have been needlessly industrious;—these

particulars cannot be passed over without observation, they are so obvious and emergent out of the thing itself:—1. That as marriage was the first institution that God ordained, so, at a marriage, was the first miracle, that our Saviour wrought. 2. That as he had showed himself miraculous but a little while ago in an extraordinary fast, so doth he now by an extraordinary provision for a feast. 3. That though he refused to turn stones into bread, to satisfy his own hunger, because it would have been for the satisfaction of Satan,—yet doth he not refuse to turn water into wine, to make up the full festivity at a marriage, because it would be for the showing forth of his own glory. 4. That as the first miracle, that was wrought in the world by man, was transformationⁱ, so is the first miracle that was wrought by the Son of man; and he worketh no more of the same nature. 5. That as the first time you hear of John Baptist in his public ministry, you hear of his strict diet, and that he cometh neither eating nor drinking; so the first time you hear of Christ, towards his public ministry, you hear of him at a marriage-feast, and turning water into wine. 6. If any will observe, from his being at this marriage-feast, that he honoured marriage, and allowed of moderate and sober feasting: or, 7. If from this, and his turning water into wine, any will think of the marriage of Christ and his church, and of things changed into a better condition under the gospel, and of the elements of the gospel-sacraments, water and wine,—he hath liberty, if he can find any profit in such observations. But how Christ's being present at this marriage, should discharge marriage of the disorders wherein it was before by divorces, re-marriages, polygamies,—and so make Christian marriage a sacrament, as the Rhemists note upon this place,—is a thing so far fetched, that it is an argument only fit for Papists, that have such an implicit faith, as to believe any thing. And if one should have questioned the Rhemists, 'Did not Christ, by being present at this and other feasts, discharge feasts also of their disorders of drunkenness, excess, and vanity, and make Christian feasting a sacrament too,'—no doubt we should have some very learned distinction to show the difference.

§ "In Cana of Galilee."] Expositors, even generally, do speak here of a 'Cana the Great,' and 'Cana the Less;' the

ⁱ Exod. vii. 9. 20.

Greater, near Sidon,—the Less, they agree not where: the one, as Maldonat tells us, called, ‘Cana Sidoniorum,’ or ‘Cana of the Sidonians;’ and the other, ‘Cana of Galilee.’ I cannot track this distinction farther back, than to Jerome, “in locis Hebraicis:” and, withal, I cannot see why it should be so currently and generally entertained as it is: unless he had given better grounds for it, than I find any. It is true, indeed, that the Scripture speaketh of a double Cana; one in the tribe of Asher^j, and the other in the tribe of Ephraim^k. That, in the tribe of Asher, is mentioned, indeed, with Great Sidon, not with any inference that it lay so very near it, but that the lines of Asher’s coast went up towards Sidon; for of that, and not of Cana’s being near Sidon, is that place to be understood. Now, that this Cana was certainly in Galilee, is past denial; for Asher was in Galilee: and where to find another Cana, in Galilee, I believe it will be impossible to tell. This, therefore, I cannot but conclude to be the place; and that it is called ‘Cana of Galilee,’ to distinguish it from the other Cana, in the tribe of Ephraim, which was ‘Cana of Samaria.’ And thus, supposing this our Cana to be in the tribe of Asher, as the Scripture sheweth it us, those words of Jacob^l may not unfitly be applied to this present occurrence there, that now “Asher yieldeth royal dainties” indeed, when Christ turneth water into wine.

Josephus once resided in this town, as he testifieth himself^m: Διέτριβον δὲ κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκείνον ἐν κώμῃ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἣν προσαγορεύεται Κανά. “I was at that time in the town of Galilee, called Cana.” And he relateth, that, having a sudden occasion to go from thence to Tiberias, he marched all night, and came thither early in the morning.

§ “And the mother of Jesus was there.”] His father Joseph, it is like, was now dead; for there is no mention of him any more in the gospel: and when Christ died, then it is apparent, that Mary was a widow; for he commendeth her to his disciple, John, and he taketh her to his own houseⁿ.

Now, Mary had very near kindred in this town of Cana; namely, Mary, the wife of Alpheus, or Cleopas, and all that family, by that relation. For, 1. Mary, the wife of Cleopas, is called her sister^o: and that same Mary is called the mo-

^j Josh. xix. 28.

^m In vita sua.

^k Josh. xvi. 8, and xvii. 9.

ⁿ John, xix. 26, &c.

^l Gen. xlix. 20.

^o John, xix. 25.

ther of James and Joses^p, which were undoubtedly the sons of Alpheus^q. So that Alpheus and Cleopas were but one and the same name; and Mary, his wife, was very near allied to the Virgin Mary. 2. Alpheus and his family lived in Cana, as may be collected by this,—that one of his sons, namely, Simon, is called a Canaanite, to distinguish him from Simon Peter^r: and he is called a Canaanite, as meaning and importing that he was a man of Cana.

That this marriage, therefore, was in Alpheus's house, may be supposed upon this:—1. That Mary and Jesus, their near kindred, are invited, and all Jesus's disciples, for his sake. 2. That Mary, the mother of Jesus, is so careful about the wine, lest the feast should be spoiled, and the bridegroom and his family should be disgraced by it. And, 3. In that the evangelist, presently after the story of this feast, speaketh of 'brethren of Jesus,' that is, his kinsmen, that went with him to Capernaum, ver. 12; whereas he had no kinsmen in his company before this feast at all. Now these kinsmen or brethren were James, and Juda, and Simeon, and Joses^s.

Ver. 3: "The mother of Jesus saith unto him, 'They have no wine.'"] As it is apparent, by the very frame of these words, that the Virgin looked after a miracle; so it is something strange, upon what ground she doth expect it. Had she seen any miracle done by him heretofore? Some conceive she had; as that, in the poor and indigent estate of Joseph, he had sometimes supplied necessities by miracle, when he lived there, as a private man: but this hath not such certainty in itself, or ground in Scripture, as to be a sufficient resolution, that this was the ground, upon which his mother now desires a miracle. But this is undoubted, that she knew him to be the Messiah, and the Son of God; this she had had so many evidences and assurances of, that that was past all denial with her; and, it may be, that was it that she built upon, when she proposeth to him, to provide wine in a miraculous way. It is true, no question, that her eye was upon that,—and upon that power that was lodged in his being the 'Son of God,' as knowing that he was able to do such a thing, if it pleased him;—but what warrant had she to urge the acting of that power? since, for aught

^p Matt. xxvii. 56.

^q Mark, iii. 18.

^r Mark, iii. 18, and vi. 3.

^s Mark, vi. 3.

we find, she had never seen him do any miracle before: nay, where, or whence, had she intimation of his doing any miracle at all? Yes, she had intimation of such a thing, and of such a thing to be begun ere long, from those words of Christ, spoken but the day before: "From henceforth ye shall see the heavens opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man." From those very words, I conceive, she took the rise of her demanding a miracle from her son. For, in them, he plainly told his disciples, then present with him (and there is very good ground to suppose her then to be in the company too), that "they should see, ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, 'from that time,' some divine and heavenly manifestation of him, though he were the Son of man, yet to be the Son of God; and that now he would begin to show himself in his actings and workings of wonders, agreeable and suitable to one, that had heaven and angels at his will and attendance." Upon this it is, that she builds her request and proposal at this time; and her words are words of faith, for 'she believeth what Christ had spoken, and, therefore, she speaketh;' and although she receiveth some check in Christ's answer to her, for her going about to limit and determine the 'hic et nunc' of those his miraculous actions, yet was the proposal itself a fruit of her faith; and Christ seeth so much in her, and refuseth her not.

Ver. 4: "Woman, what have I to do with thee?"] There is exceeding much ado, among the Romish party, to mince and to qualify these words, that they may not be a reprehension: for they cannot endure, that any one should think, that the Virgin Mary ever did any thing worthy of reproof. The Rhemists' gloss upon the words, shall serve to show their industry in this matter, to spare the alleging of more, which might be done exceeding abundantly, and (when all is alleged) but to little satisfaction:—"Christ then may mean here (say they), What is that, woman, to me and thee, being but strangers, that they want wine? as some interpret it: or (which is the more proper use of that kind of speech in Holy Writ), What have I to do with thee? that is, Why should I have respect to thy desire in this case? In matters touching my charge, and the commission of my Father for preaching, working miracles, and other graces, I must not be tied to flesh and blood. Which was not a reprehension of our Lady, or signification that he would not hear her in this or

other things pertaining to God's glory, or the good of men; for the event showeth the contrary; but it was a lesson to the company that heard it, and namely to the disciples,—that respect of kindred should not draw them to do any thing against reason, or be the principal motion, why they do their duties, but God's glory." And, a little after, "Our Lady knew it was no check to her, but a doctrine to others." Now, 'quorsum hoc?' Why do these men, and, generally, all the expositors, of the same school,—keep such ado to clear this from a reprehension?—Why, because the Virgin Mary must have no check by any means: but if it had been any woman in the world but she, or any man in the world but Peter,—it is a question, whether we should have had all this ado to carry these words out of a reprehension.

The manner of the expression, they cannot deny to be of a reprehensive nature; the common use of it in Scripture is so apparent^t: and divers of the most ancient fathers have understood it here in such a sense; as, Irenæus, Chrysostom, Austin, Athanasius,—produced by Beza upon the place. It is more pertinent and to the purpose, therefore, to examine the reason why our Saviour giveth his mother such a check, than to seek evasions and arguments to discharge it from being such a thing.

There be that have conceived that our Saviour, that knew all hearts, did perceive a little pride and vain-glory breathing in these words of his mother, as if she sought for, and was tickled with, some desire of esteem and glory, which would redound to her upon these actions of her son.—But upon what ground they have built so uncharitable a gloss as this, is far from apparency. Although we hold not the Virgin Mary free from sin, as the Papists do (for, upon Mark iii. 31, we cannot but lay a very foul sin to her charge), yet do I not know any cause for which to charge her with pride; especially here, where the respect and care of her kinsman's credit, in whose house she now was, did move her to propose this to her son, rather than any respect of her own. But others, more charitably somewhat, have construed it so, as if Christ should check her for going about to keep him still under her maternal correction and commands, when he was now come to so full an age, as that he might

^t Judg. xi. 12. 2 Sam. xvi. 10. Ezra, iv. 3. Matt. viii. 29.

very well be guide of his own actions; and, accordingly, they have read the latter clause by way of question, ‘What? is not mine hour yet come,’ that I may be at mine own disposal, but still must be at the mother’s command?—But, besides the quaintness of this interrogative reading, hardly warranted by any copy extant, it may very well be supposed, that there was something more that our Saviour looked after in the matter, than his own privilege and immunity from his mother’s command: or else, as the former exposition laid some aspersion of pride upon the mother, this doth very nearly do it upon the son. The mind of Christ, therefore, in the uttering of these words, may best be understood by those that he speaketh with them, “Mine hour is not yet come;” he being the best expositor of himself, if we can rightly expound those.

§ “Mine hour is not yet come.”] Not to trouble myself and the reader to show that *ὥρα*, ‘an hour,’ in Scripture, is not always taken in that strict sense, as ‘an hour’ properly is taken with us; but that it very commonly and often is used to signify ‘time in general,’ and of an undefined measure; these words of Christ seem to have this aim. He had told the day before, that *ἀπ’ ἄρτι*, “from thenceforth they should see the heavens opened,” &c; that is, that ‘now he began to be revealed, and from henceforward he must declare himself in his public ministry and in power.’ Mary taketh occasion of her proposal to him for this miracle from his own words, as was observed before; but Christ says No; upon this reason,—because his working miracles was to confirm his doctrine; and, therefore, it were fit he should first preach and show his first miracle rather upon a sermon than upon a feast. And that this is his mind in this clause, may be concluded by his condescension,—and in that he doth accomplish what the Virgin his mother doth desire, although he seem to deny her desire. He first gives her a mild reprehension, for that she will be meddling so with his ministerial acting, as that when he hath but told that he must do miracles, she will offer to prescribe the time and occasion. This he doth in those words, ‘Woman, what have I to do with thee?’ He then rectifies her in the doctrine concerning his miracles,—namely, that they were not to be acted upon all offers and occasions, but to confirm his doctrine among those incredulous ones, that, unless they saw a sign

or wonder, would not believe. This he doth in this clause, 'Mine hour is not yet come.' And then he acts the miracle that she did desire, because he knew it would have the fruit here, that his miracles aimed and looked after,—namely, belief in those that saw it: and so it had; for his disciples, that he had chosen before in the former chapter, believed on him, ver. 11; and there were new ones added, of his own kindred. So that, though the former part of Christ's speech, in this verse, be a flat reprehension of his mother, yet is not the latter part a flat denial of her request, but an exposition of the most proper meaning of his former words. Now, if it be questioned when that hour came of which he speaketh, it is answered by some,—when John Baptist was laid up in his prison; for that then it is said, 'Jesus began to preach,' &c: but it is more than apparent, that Jesus both preached very much, and did miracles very many, before that time; and, therefore, those words, 'From that time Jesus began to preach,' are to be construed in another sense, than in an antithesis to what he had done before; as shall be showed when we come there. And this 'hour' that he speaketh of here, is to be understood of the first time of his public ministry and miracles after this; which the text at the farthest gives account to have been at Jerusalem, at the Passover, ver. 23. For Jerusalem was the chief city, and the place where Messias was especially looked for; and, therefore, the evangelist doth properly refer us thither for the miracles after this; and to observe 'his hour' there come.

The strangeness of Christ's seeming to deny to do this miracle, and yet doing it, hath put some upon this manner of reconciling of the matter,—namely, that while there was any wine remaining, he refused to do it, lest the miracle should not be apparent enough; but some suspicion might have been, that there was some remnant of, or some mixture with, the old wine: but when that was all gone, then he wrought the miracle, and then it was undeniable. And, accordingly, they understand the tense in the Greek, ὑστερήσαντος οἴνου, not when the wine was 'clean gone,' but when it 'was in failing.' But, besides that the Greek word will not make this out, the same cavil might have been now, if they would have cavilled, as before: for the cross-grained unbelievers, that would have said before, that 'there was some mixture of the water with the wine that remained;' might say now as

well, that 'there was some mixture of the water with some wine, that was concealed.'

Ver. 5: "His mother saith unto the servants, 'Whatsoever he saith unto you, do it.'"] Here is a scruple, that Mary should be denied, as she was in the verse before, and yet be so confident of the thing to be done, as she is in this. Divers answers are given to it; as, 1. That she doubted not, but that he would begin to work miracles the sooner for her sake. 2. That she was assured of his power, and of his benignity towards all. 3. By her familiarity with him, and acquaintance with all his manner of speeches, she knew it was no repulse. 4. The strength of her faith would not suffer her to doubt. 5. It may be, after his check given her for instruction, he showed some evidence, that he would do this thing, either by word or gesture, which the evangelist hath concealed. 6. There is 'negatio probationis,' sometimes used in Scripture; as, the angels^u say unto Lot, "Nay, but we will lodge in the streets;" and, "It is not meet to take the children's bread, and cast it to dogs^v." Not that the angels were fixedly resolved to lie in the streets all night, but that they would try and put on Lot's importunity: nor that Christ was determinately resolved not to help the woman of Canaan, but that he would try and exercise her faith: so may we understand the denial here, and so did Mary understand it. Not that he did hereby, totally and irreversibly, gainsay her desire and proposal [the sequel shows the contrary], but that he would instruct her, and inform her understanding, and prove and strain her faith, to see how it would act upon such a denial. And it acted strongly; and as she asked in faith, so she goes on in faith; and according to her faith, it was done unto her.

Ver. 6: "And there were set there six water-pots of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews." By 'purifying' here, is not meant those sprinklings and washings, that were commanded by the law for the cleansing of the unclean [for that uncleanness lasted till even, and what to do with those washings at a feast?], but those traditional and Pharisaical washings of the hands, mentioned Matt. xv. 2; which the Jews used before they ate bread,—and of tables, and cups, and platters, mentioned Mark vii. Now, there is a special tract in the Talmud, concerning this wash-

^u Gen. xix. 2.

^v Matt. xv. 26.

ing of their hands, called ידים which may give some light to this matter in hand. There is discoursed, first, concerning the quantity of water necessary for one man's hands, or the 'minimum quod sic,' the least measure that may be used,—and such as, if there be less, the washing is not right; their rule for that is this, מ' רביעית נותנין לידים לאחר אף לשנים, מ' מחצירת לוג לשלשה או לארבעה מלוג לחמשה ולעשרה ולמאה that is, "they allow the fourth part of a log of water to the hands of one man, yea, of two, half a log to three or four, a whole log to five, or to ten, or to a hundred." Now this measure, called a log, mentioned Lev. xiv. 12, we shall consider of by and by.

Then they discourse concerning the vessels, in which water is to be put for this purpose, and that matter they determine thus; בכל הכלים נותנין לידים אפילו בכלי גללים בכלי; "That water for the hands may be put in any vessel, yea, even in a vessel of ox dung" [for so the Hebrew gloss upon the place explaineth גללים, viz. צואת בקר]; or, "in a vessel of stone" [such were those vessels we have in mention here]; or, "in a vessel of earth." Then they speak of the manner of washing, that it is by pouring of water upon the hands out of a vessel; and they dispute, what water this must be; which will be more proper to consider of, upon Matt. xv, if the Lord bring us thither: and there also may be produced the prayer they made, when they washed their hands.

But for our present purpose, it appeareth by the rule they give about washing the hands, that these vessels, mentioned here by the evangelist, were not the vessels out of which they poured water upon their hands when they washed,—for these were too heavy for such a purpose,—but they stood here with water in them, to take out from thence either into the vessels that they poured out of upon their hands, or for washing of their cups and tables, as occasion served. Now, the number of six was not either the set and constant number of such vessels at such occasions; nor is there any mystical business in it; but the number of vessels was now suited to the company of guests, and occasion of much washing: and their number is mentioned for the setting forth of the miracle the more, when not only so much water was made wine in an instant, but also in so many several vessels.

§ "Containing two or three firkins a piece."] In searching

after the quantity and contents of these vessels, we may very fitly preface the words, that Camerarius useth upon them; “De mensuris atque nummis cum non potuerint a diversorum populorum et temporum hominibus, nisi diversa tradi, consequens est esse incerta de his rebus nobis omnia.” Diversity of coins and measures, in divers times and places, must needs breed an ambiguity, if not an impossibility, of punctually determining and deciding what any measure or value of coin was of old, almost in any place that can be named.

The present difference of the names of measures, and of measures themselves in our own land, may be evidence and argument enough for one of these; and we need go no farther. And, therefore, we shall not be so bold as to go about absolutely to tell the reader what a metreta was, which is the measure here spoken of; but only to present him with some conjectures and opinions about this matter, and leave him to his own choice and judgment.

The Syriac expoundeth Μετρητὰς, by רבעין ‘fourth parts;’ but of what, it is uncertain; unless he allude to the measure, alleged even now out of the Talmud, ‘the fourth part of a log,’ which was the least measure, that might be used in washing of their hands. The Arabic hath almost reserved the very Greek word, and so he helpeth nothing to the understanding of it.

We observed before, that the LXX use it to express בת and סאה by. Now, if these two were of the same quantity and capacity, we might here take a rise to aim at what a metreta was; but they were not so. Certain it is, that a bath and an ephah were one and the same measure; the ephah for dry things, and the bath for liquid. This is plain^u; “The ephah and the bath shall be of one measure, that the bath may contain the tenth part of a homer, and the ephah the tenth part of a homer.” But seah was but the third part of a bath; and so the Talmud, in Erubhin, saith, that a bath containeth שלש סאין ‘three seahs.’ And so the Chaldee paraphrast, on that place of Ezekiel, : טקום חד יהי לכוון סכום תלת סאין “The ephah and the bath shall be of one measure, to contain three seahs.” And Rabbi Solomon, on that place, speaketh the very same sense, when he saith, ‘a homer containeth thirty seahs;’ for then

^u Ezek. xlv. 11.

a bath and ephah, which are the tenth part of it, contain three. And this, both the Chaldee and the Septuagint mean, when they render an ephah, by תלת סאין and τρία μέτρα^x; and thus he helpeth to construe that phrase, Gen. xviii. 6, ‘Make ready three measures of meal;’ שלש סאים ‘three seahs,’ that is, an ephah; and Matt. xiii. 33, ‘A woman hid leaven in three measures of meal, εἰς σάτα τρία, in three seahs,’ that is, an ephah. By which difference of measure, and yet the Septuagint’s using but one and the same word to express both, we see that they use the word μετρητής in a general sense, for this or that measure; and they settle us but little in the determination of what certain and fixed measure a metreta was.

I will not trouble the reader with curiosity to examine what measure this was among the Greeks, or among the Romans; for there is mention of it as being in use among both those nations; but, as the story we have in hand, lieth among the Jews, so will it be not only the easiest and plainest for the reader, but also the likeliest and nearest way for resolution of the thing, to look for this measure only among the measures of the Jews, by which they measured liquid things; for of such things is the measure here in story.

For the best discovery of which thing that we seek for, it will not be impertinent to such a purpose [certainly, it will not be unprofitable to the reader], that we go by these two steps:—1. To reckon up in brief what measures were in use amongst the Jews, especially those that were to measure liquid things. 2. To choose and pick out of all them, as near as we can, which was the μετρητής, that is here intended.

First, therefore, to take a note of the Jewish measure in use among them:—

1. The greatest of all was the ‘*homer*’ (חומר), mentioned Lev. xxvii. 16, Num. xi. 37, Isa. v. 10, Hos. iii. 2, Ezek. xlv. 11; derived either from ‘*hamor*,’ which signifieth ‘an ass,’ as being an ass-load; or rather meaning ‘a heap,’ for so the word signifieth, Exod. viii. 14, Heb. iii. 15; as containing so much as would make a good heap.

This measure is also called *cor* (כור), 2 Chron. ii. 10, Ezra vii. 22, 1 Kings v. 11. For, that a homer and a cor

^x Exod. xvi. 36, and Isa. v. 10.

were all one, is not only apparent by the LXX, who translate 'homer' by *Kópos*, Lev. xxvii. 16, Num. xi. 32, &c,—and by the Chaldee paraphrast, who doth the like, Ezek. xlv. 11,—and by the consent of the Jews; but also by the express text of Scripture itself, Ezek. xlv. 14, "Ye shall offer the tenth part of a bath out of the cor, which is a homer of ten baths," &c.

2. Their second measure was lethech (לֶתֶח), mentioned Hos. iii. 2, and not elsewhere. This was half the homer, or cor, as the Greek and Hebrew interpreters there do generally agree, and as the very sense of the place itself doth enforce to construe it. For the prophet, in that place, is plainly describing the value of all the ages of the males of Israel, as they were rated, Lev. xxvii; and this verse, expounded and construed by that chapter, doth of itself tell, that 'a lethech of barley was half a homer,' as our English hath well rendered it.

3. Their third measure was the bath and ephah (בַּת, אֵפָה), the one for liquid things, and the other for dry, as was said before; and either of them was the tenth part of a homer, or a cor^y. The Jews, on 1 Kings vii. 26, apply the bath in one kind, to measure dry things; for, whereas it is said there, that the brazen sea contained two thousand baths; and, in 2 Chron. iv. 4, 5, that it contained three thousand baths;—they generally reconcile it thus,—that it held only two thousand baths of liquid things, but three thousand of dry, because those might be heaped above the brims, even to the quantity as to make up a third part^z.

4. Their fourth measure was seah (סֵא), which was the third part of an ephah, of which before. And a fifth measure in use among them for liquid things, was the hin (הֵין), of which is mention, Exod. xxix. 40, and xxx. 24; Num. v. 4, 5, &c. This, Aben Ezra, on Exod. xxix, holdeth to be an Egyptian measure, and his fellow-Jews conclude that it contained twelve logs; so Kimchi in Michol; and to the same sense R. Sol. on Exod. xxix, when he expoundeth the fourth part of a hin, שְׁלֹשָׁה לֹגִין 'three logs.' The proportion that we read of betwixt flour and liquid things in their offerings, helps us but little to understand the quantity of this measure, when a hin is proportioned to an ephah (Ezek. xlv. 24),

^y Ezek. xlv. 11.

^z See the Chaldee Paraph. R. Solom. R. Lev. and Kimchi, there.

and half a hin to three tenth-deals, which was not fully the third part of an ephah^a.

5. A fifth measure in use among them was log (לוג), named instantly before, and mentioned Lev. xiv. 12, and nowhere else,—and there translated by the LXX κοτύλη.

6. There was also the omer, mentioned Exod. xvi. 36. This (עמר) omer was the tenth part of an ephah, as an ephah was the tenth part of a homer (חומר). This is called, therefore, עשרון a ‘tenth part;’ as our English expresseth it, a ‘tenth-deal^b,’ because it was the tenth part of an ephah.

7. There is also mention of a kab (קב), 2 Kings vi. 25, in that sad and strange story of the famine in Samaria, when “the fourth part of a kab of doves’ dung was sold for five pieces of silver.”

8. There is also mention of *Ξέστης*, Mark vii. 4, or ‘sex-tarius,’ as it is well translated by Beza, and that translation backed out of Galen,—and the sense, as it seemeth, consented to by the Syriac, who retaineth the very Greek word; but, since this was plainly a Roman measure, we shall not insist upon it.

And now, if we come to the second thing that was proposed, that is, to pick and choose out of all this number of Jewish measures, the *μετρητής*, that our evangelist mentioneth here,—I should as soon fix upon the bath to be it, as any other whatsoever, and that upon this reason:—because the bath was the very standard of all liquid measures, as the ephah also was of the dry. The homer and the cor were measured out by the bath and the ephah, as our quarter is by the bushel^c; and all inferior measures were fitted, in their several proportions, to the bath and ephah^d. And, therefore, the evangelist mentioning a ‘metreta,’ or the ‘measure,’ as the very word signifieth, with a kind of emphasis, I see not to what measure possibly it can be applied so properly, as to this standing measure and standard measure of the bath. It is true, indeed, that the hin is made a standard measure with the ephah, Lev. xix. 36; but the reason is, because it was so indeed for holy things,—as for oil or wine that were to be offered; and with other things than holy we never read it mentioned: but for things measured for common use, the bath was the standard for liquids,

^a Num. xxviii. 12. 14.

^c Ezek. xlv. 14.

^b Num. xv. 6, and xxviii. 13, 14.

^d Ezek. xlv. 10, 11.

which, there, and in some other places, is concluded under the word ephah, with which it was equal. And, therefore, as amongst us in England, where our bushel is the standard measure for dry things [and by which our quarter is measured, and to which our half bushel and peck are proportioned], we commonly, by the word ‘measure,’ understand a bushel; and when we ask, ‘How is corn sold a measure,’ we are readily apprehended so to mean;—so was the word *μετρητής* used both in Greece, where it was native,—and in other places, where the word was borrowed; and it was understood, in those places, of that measure that was most standing, and, indeed, a measure to other measures, as the bath was among the Jews to all liquid measures; and, therefore, I cannot but understand the bath by *μετρητής* here.

Now, to give account of the contents and quantity of this and of the other measures, mentioned before, as it is not a thing of facility, so shall we not be too curious in it: and, as it is not a matter for this time and place, so shall not much time be spent upon it, but the reader left to the perusal of those authors, that have purposely set themselves to such a work. Only these few particulars let him take up for the present:—

First; The Jews themselves, upon their own measures mentioned, set these gages:—

1. רביעית ‘quadrans,’ or, the ‘fourth part,’—which they sometimes mention without any more addition, but which meaneth, the fourth part of a log,—containeth ביצה ומהצה one egg-shell full and a half^e: thus much water was enough for the washing of two men’s hands, if there were no more water.

2. והוא שיעור ששה a log containeth four quadrants, and it is the measure of six egg-shells’ full^f.

3. קב a kab is four logs; it containeth twenty-four egg-shells’ full^g.

4. הין a hin is twelve logs, or three kabs, containing seventy-two egg-shells’ full^h.

5. סאת satum, is two hins, six kabs, twenty-four logs, one hundred and forty-four eggsⁱ.

6. אפה and בת an ephah and bath, is three seahs or sata,

^e So the Hebrew comment on Misna, Jadajim, cap. 1.

^f Kimch. in Michol.

^g Alphes. de Pasc. cap. 5.

^h Idem.

ⁱ Idem. and Kimch. ubi supra.

six hins, eighteen kabs, seventy-two logs, and four hundred and thirty-two egg-shells' full^k.

Secondly ; Now, upon these accounts, which are generally current among the Jews,—the measure of these water-pots will fall exceeding short of that gage, that some give them,—as that every metreta should contain a hundred weight of wine ; and that Christ, by this miracle, afforded two tun of wine, within two hundred weight. The Jewish bath was far from so great a reception ; as, if there were no other argument to prove it, might be cleared by this ; that an ephah, which was the same measure with it, was such a quantity of corn, as would serve about ten men for bread for one day, and was little or nothing more. This appeareth by Exod. xvi, where the constant proportion of manna for a man a day, was an omer, which was the tenth part of an ephah. And, by the Chaldee paraphrast's supposal upon Ruth iii. 15, where, according to his translation, which seems to be very proper, Ruth carrieth two ephahs, or six seahs of barley, in her skirt. And, certainly, in the Septuagint's account, the bath was not of so vast a measure as to hold one hundred pound weight of water, when they translate it *κεράμιον ἓν*, 'one pitcher-full,' Isa. v. 10 ; where these words, "ten acres of vineyard shall yield one bath, and the seed of a homer shall yield an ephah," are thus translated by them :—"Where ten yoke of oxen work, it shall yield one pitcher-full, and he that soweth six artabæ, shall have three measures," meaning three seahs :—where, and in other places of them, I cannot but observe, that they call the seah, which was an exceeding common measure, *μέτρον*, 'the measure ;' and I cannot but conceive, that the bath and ephah, which were the standard to it, are called *μετρητὰι*, 'the measures.' Their exact receipt I will not go about to determine ;—that requires a set and intentional discourse ;—but I shall leave the matter for the reader to conjecture at, by what hath been spoken.

Ver. 8: "The governor of the feast."] There is mention among the heathen authors of the 'Symposiarchus,' 'the governor or moderator in their feasts,' of which Plutarch discourseth largely in Sympos. lib. 1. quæst. 4: out of whom it may not be impertinent to character him a little ; that so we may the better scan and try, whether our 'Architricli-

^k Idem.

nus' here, and their 'Symposiarchus' there, were the same, yea or no.

He was one chosen among the guests, τῶν συμποτῶν συμποτικώτατος, μήτε τῷ μεθύειν εὐάλωτος, μήτε πρὸς τὸ πίνειν ἀπρόθυμος: 'that was most festivous of all the company, and that would not be drunk, and yet that would drink freely.' He was to rule the company, and to prohibit their being disorderly, yet not prohibiting their being merry. He was to observe the temper of the guests, and how the wine wrought upon them, and how every one could bear his wine; and, accordingly, to apply himself to them, to keep them all in a harmony, and an equilibrial composure, that there might be no disquiet nor disorder. For the effecting of this, he used these two ways;—first, to proclaim liberty to every one to drink what he thought good. Ἐμαυτὸν αἰροῦμαι συμποσίαρχον ὑμῶν, καὶ κελεύω τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους, ὡς βούλονται, πίνειν ἐντῷ παρόντι, "I am Symposiarchus (said he), and I license every one to drink at this time, as they will." And, secondly, upon observing, who among the guests was most ready to be touched and distempered with wine, to mingle the more water with his wine, thereby to keep him in an equal pace of sobriety with the other. And so the work and office of this 'Symposiarchus,' or 'governor of the feast,' was especially double,—to take care, that none should be forced to drink; and to take care, that none should be drunk, though unforced. Of such another office might the Architriclinus be conceived here; namely, some one that was specially appointed to give entertainment, and that had special employment about the distributing and disposing of the wine. And this might seem to appear the rather, because our Saviour directeth the servitors to bring the miraculous wine to be tasted first by him. But I should understand rather by Architriclinus here, the 'chief guest at the feast,' than such a Symposiarchus; which it may be some question, whether he were in use among the Jews, or no. For [not to go about to give account of their manner of sitting at their feasts, in this place,—it will be more proper elsewhere,—though from thence might be showed something towards the proof of this my supposal],—let it but be considered, that the Architriclinus in mention, was a mere stranger to the business of the wine, and knew not how it went. Had Plutarch's Symposiarchus been here, he would readily have

known what quantity of wine, and what variety, there was in the house; he would have well known, that all the wine was gone, and that they were at a loss for more; for the yeomanry of the wine was his office at that time, above all other things, and above all other men. But this Architriclinus knew none of these things; but thought the bridegroom had used a friendly deceit, to reserve the best wine to make up their mouths, whereas others used to reserve the worst: and he speaks as a guest, and not as a yeoman of the feast: and our Saviour sends the wine to him, as to the chiefest man at the table, and as the fittest from whom the taste of the wine, and the taste of the miracle wrought, might be distributed and dispersed throughout all the company of the feast.

Ver. 12: “After this he went down to Capernaum, and continued not there many days.”] Capernaum was his own city, as was said before, and his return is still thither; as Samuel’s return^k, after his circuit, was still to Ramah, for that was his own city^l. Now, his stay was but a little there, because the Passover calls him up to Jerusalem. And thus, when the Passover comes, there is half a year passed, since he was baptized; forty days of which, he spent in the wilderness, in his fast, before the tempter came to him,—beside what time was spent in the threefold temptation, and in his going to, and coming from, the wilderness. Three days you have account of him, at Jordan, and going into Galilee, John i. 29. 35. 43; and, the next day after, he is at Cana at a feast: this was the fourth day from his first appearing from the wilderness, but the third from his saving and entertaining any disciples. So that we have but the account of six weeks, or thereabouts, upon record, of all the time he spent betwixt his baptism, and his first Passover. The rest is concealed; and much of it was spent in his peragrations and preaching through Galilee, to which he addresseth himself^m.

Ver. 13: “And the Jews’ Passover was at hand, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem.”] There are none other of the evangelists, that mention any Passover at all after Christ’s baptism, but that at which he suffered: but John reckoneth not only that, but three before; and so still, amongst all the

^k 1 Sam. vii. 17.

^l See Matt. iv. 14, and viii. 5. Matt. ix. 1, compared with Mark, ii. 1. Matt. xvii. 24. John, vi. 17, &c.

^m John, i. 43.

four evangelists, the story is made up and completed, that there is nothing wanting. Three of his Passovers, John nameth plainly and expressly by name,—viz. this here; and another, chap. vi. 4; and his last, chap. xviii. 39; but a fourth, he hath not so openly named, but meaneth it in chap. v. 1; as shall be cleared, by God's permission, when we come there. And now hath Christ three years to his death; and he hath had half a year since his baptism; and so is his time, from his anointing by the Spirit for the work of the gospel, till his offering up upon his cross, three years and a half: see the notes on Luke, iii. 21.

Now, whereas the evangelist calleth the Passover, 'the Passover of the Jews;'—Jansenius is of opinion, that he doth it for distinction of it from 'the Easter of the Christians,' which (saith he) was observed by them throughout all Asia, when John wrote his Gospel. And Baroniusⁿ yet goes farther, and would prove it, from John's^o calling the Christian sabbath, 'the Lord's day.' It is not worth the labour, at least, not in this place, to look after the antiquity and original of the celebration of Easter amongst the Christians in the primitive times; the quarrel about the day, between the eastern and western churches, is famous in ecclesiastical stories: but, that this is not the intention of the evangelist in this place, we need to go no farther to prove, than to his own expression of the same thing in another, where he^p calleth it, 'The Passover, a feast of the Jews;' and so sheweth, that, in this short phrase, 'The Jews' Passover,'—he meaneth not so much to distinguish it from any festival of the Christians, as to show, what it was to Jews, and to distinguish it from other festivals of theirs.

§ "And Jesus went up to Jerusalem."] 1. In obedience to the law, of the males' appearing before the Lord^q, from which none were excepted, but for some infirmity or incapacity. "All are bound to appear, but only the deaf, fools, little ones, the man that is bruised in his genitals, hermaphrodites, women, servants that were not set free, the lame, blind, sick, and old:" thus the tradition in the Talmud^r.

Christ came, no doubt, to the Passover every year before this, all the while he lived a private man, though only one of his journeys then is mentioned, Luke ii; but now he comes

ⁿ Annal. ad annum 159.

^o Rev. i.

^p John, vi. 4.

^q Exod. xxiii. 17.

^r Hagigah, cap. 1.

upon some reason and cause, besides that that brought him then : he came then in observance of the Passover only, and of that institution that did ordain it ; and so he doth likewise now, but he doth it not only upon that reason. But, 2. He cometh now up to the Passover also, that he might take the opportunity of the concourse of the people to show himself, and to work his miracles. This was the first festival, that came since he was baptized [the feast of dedication we reckon not with the great solemnities], and this was the greatest festival of all the three ; and now was the greatest concourse of people there to be expected ; and, therefore, this was the fittest time for Christ to begin to show himself, when he would show himself in the most public manner : and this had been enough to have brought him up thither, had not the religiousness of the feast obliged him, and he owned the obligation.

The ceremonial law of the Jews obliged them, either as single and particular men, or as members of the congregation, and people of Israel. The Passover, and the other festivals, were of the latter form ; for in them, all the males of Israel were together, as embodied into one society, and the meeting itself was to teach them so much. Now, though our Saviour did not so punctually set himself to perform the parts of the ceremonial law, that concerned men singly, and as particular men,—for we do not find that he offered sacrifice, or that he was ever besprinkled with the water of purification, or the like ;—yet, was he constant in those things, that referred to men, as joint-members of the church of Israel ; especially in the sacraments, circumcision and the Passover, which aimed mainly at that communion. Let separatists study upon this.

Ver. 14 : “ And he found in the temple.”] The whole ‘mountain of the house’ [as the Jews do commonly call it] was called ‘the temple ;’ that is, all that space of ground, which, with a wall about it, was distinguished מִדְּהוּל from the profane, or from the common, ground. This plot of ground, thus enclosed, was five hundred cubits long, and five hundred cubits broad. Ezekiel^s, in his dimensions that he giveth, retaineth this number of five hundred and five hundred, though, instead of a cubit, he speaketh of a reed of six cubits and a hand breadth.

Out of this space of ground were taken these several measures:—1. The court of the women, which was one hundred and thirty-five cubits long, and one hundred and thirty-five cubits broad. 2. The court of Israel, the court of the priests, and the place of the temple, all which took up one hundred and eighty-seven cubits in length, and one hundred and thirty-five in breadth: the length, from east to west; the breadth, from north to south. Now, the length was thus distributed,—
 עשרה דריסת ישראל א עשרה Israel's treading was eleven cubits; the priests' treading, eleven cubits; the compass of the altar, thirty-two cubits; betwixt the altar and the porch, twelve cubits; the length of the temple itself, one hundred cubits; and beyond the oracle, westward, eleven cubits: thus doth the Talmud measure, in Massecheth Middoth, cap. 2, and 4. 1. So that, from the entrance of the court of the women, to the wall that parted between the holy and profane, at the west end of the temple, were three hundred and twenty-two cubits; and the breadth of all the courts was the same, viz. one hundred and thirty-five cubits. Now, by this account, the space that lay without these courts, and yet within the great wall that parted betwixt holy and profane, was one hundred and seventy-eight cubits broad, at the east end, or before the court of the women, and three hundred and sixty-five cubits broad, along by the sides of all the courts, as they ran along from east to west; save what was taken up with the buildings, which were at the corners of these several courts, which took up forty cubits in this outward compass, on either side. This outward compass, by Christian writers, is most commonly called 'Atrium Gentium,' or 'the Court of the Gentiles,' because into this the Gentiles might come to worship, and bring their gifts: but the Jewish writers do sometimes express it by *הר הבית* 'The mountain of the house,' when they speak of it in contradistinction to the courts and temples. This is called, 'The court without the temple,' Rev. xi. 2; and yet commonly also called 'the temple' in Scripture; as 'the temple,' or the holy ground of it, is set in opposition to 'the city.' This outward court, or space, lay on every side the other courts, either more or less: and this the Talmud seemeth to aim at, when it saith, "The mountain of the house was *חמש מאות אמה על חמש מאות אמה* five hundred cubits upon five hundred cubits, or five hundred cubits square: and the greatest space of it was on the south,

a second part of it on the east, a third part on the north, and the least on the west; and the place where was the greatest space, there was the most service.” This court, or ‘Atrium Gentium,’ had five gates into it; two on the south side, called שַׁעֲרֵי חוּלְדָּה “The gates of Huldah, which served to go in and out at: one gate on the west, called קִפְנוּס Cephunus; this was also to go in and out at; and one gate at the north, which served not for any use, which was called טָדִי Tadi; and one gate on the east, which had Shushan, the palace, pictured on it.” “For (saith the Hebrew gloss) when they came up out of Babel, the king of Persia commanded them to portray the picture of Shushan, the palace, upon the gates of the house, that the fear of that kingdom might be before them.”

The entering into this court was not at the east gate; for, at that, only the high-priest went in and out to the burning of the red cow; and they that assisted him in that work, went in and out with him: but the coming in for all that came to worship, was on the south side, where the two gates were, where they went in at the one of them, and came out at the other. Into this outer court, came not only the heathens that were proselyted, but even mourners, lepers, and excommunicate persons.

“A mourner was prohibited to wash whilst he was in his mourning,” שֹׂאכֵל אֶסֶר לְרַחוּץ Yet might a mourner come into this place to worship; and he discovered himself to be a mourner, by coming in and going out a different way from other people: “And when it was questioned of him, why he did so, he answered, ‘I am a mourner:’ and it was replied, ‘Now, he that dwelleth in this house, comfort thee:’ or, he said, ‘I am excommunicate,’ שֹׂאנִי מִמִּדְּבָה and it was replied, ‘Now, he that dwelleth in this house, put into their heart that they may fetch thee in again;’ or, ‘He that dwelleth in this house, put into thine heart, that thou mayest hearken to the words of thy fellows, and they draw near to thee again.”

This court was parted from the court of the women, with a wooden grate, thirteen hands’ breadth high. In the north-west corner of which women’s court,—namely, in the very angle of the court of the priests,—was a parcel of building, called לְשַׁכַּת מְצוּרַעִים ‘the chambers of the lepers,’ who came thither, and were there as in a manner of a hospital, while

^t Middoth, cap. 1.

^u Beracoth, cap. 2.

the priests were about the trial of them. The heathens, mourners, lepers, excommunicate persons, came to the public service of the temple, and had the freedom of this outer court: and hither were oxen and sheep now got also; for in this court it was, that Christ found these cattle and the money-changers at this time.

§ “Those that sold oxen, and sheep, and doves.”] These were sold for sacrifices, lambs for the Passover, and bullocks for the festival after, and doves for the offerings of those women, and those lepers cleansed, that were not so rich as to reach to a lamb^v. And, it may be, sparrows were in this market too, for the cleansing of the leper: and to that, it may be, our Saviour alludeth^w, “Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing, and five for a halfpenny?” The Jews have a tradition, “That the burnt-offerings on festival-days were מן זולין of common sheep, or oxen, but their peace-offerings were of the tithes^x.” Now this tradition,—joined with the matter of conveniency against such times, as there was like to be great store of sacrifices,—caused a market to be kept at Jerusalem, of beasts and fowls, for that purpose: that those that came from far to the Passover, or to the other festivals, as our Saviour did at this time, and his company with him,—might not be forced to bring their Passover lamb, or bullock, or sacrifice lamb, or bullock, along with them, but might have such things for ready money, when they came to Jerusalem. And now, too much love of convenience had brought this market into the temple-court.

§ “And the changers of money sitting.”] There is the like story to this a little before Christ’s last Passover, when he came riding triumphantly to Jerusalem, Matt. xxi. 12, Mark xi. 15, Luke xix. 45, where he cast the buyers and sellers out of the temple, as he did here,—and, it is like, with the same course of whipping them, though it be not expressed,—and with sharper words; for here he calls them but ‘merchants’ [this was the first admonition], but there he plainly calls them ‘thieves.’

There the evangelists, Matthew and Mark, use the word κολλυβισται, for ‘money-changers;’ here the evangelist John useth both that and κερματισται too. The Syriac, in all the places, retaineth but one word מערפנא, and the Arabic doth the like. Now, what these ‘argentarii’ and ‘nummularii’

^v Lev. xii. 8, and xiv. 21.

^w Matt. x. 29. Luke, xii. 6.

^x Chagigah, cap. 1.

were [for by both these expressions do Latin translators call them], requires some inquisition to find out. We find mention of such kind of men frequently among the Romans; and one famous instance may be produced to serve for many; and that is what Suetonius^y reports concerning Augustus,—namely, that some reviled him with the baseness of his descent, as that he was ‘*Nepos nummularii*,’ ‘the grandchild of a money-changer.’ The derision is this, in an epistle of Cassius Parmensis; “*Materna tibi farina ex crudissimo Ariciæ pistrino: hanc finxit manibus collybo decoloratis Nerulonensis mensarius:*” “Of such a meal art thou by thy mother’s side; for Nerulonensis, a money-changer, having his fingers blacked with changing money, did mould her in a poor mill at Aricia:” for Augustus was said to be a miller’s grandchild. Here is mention of ‘*Collybus*,’ from whence cometh the word *κολλυβισται*, in the text before us; and the ‘*Collybista*,’ or ‘money-changer,’ is called ‘*Mensarius*,’ ‘a man of the table;’ because their profession was practised telling money upon a table: as the same Suetonius giveth us another famous example, in the life of Galba, chap. 9: “*Nummulario, non ex fide versanti pecunias, manus amputavit, mensæque ejus affixit:*” “He cut off the hands of a money-changer, for cheating, and nailed them to his table.” A man of this trade was called שולחני ‘*Shulchani*,’ among the Jews,—‘*Mensarius*,’ or ‘a man of the table;’ for in the tract Kiddushin, or concerning espousals^z, this case is determined: “A man saith to a woman, I will show thee two hundred zuzim” (this was the common sum of money undertaken by the bridegroom upon espousal), “if thou wilt be espoused to me; if he show it her, the espousal is made; but if he show it upon the table, she is not espoused:” and the glossary upon the place gives this reason, הִיא שולחני “It may be, he is *Mensarius*, a money-changer, and changeth the money of other men,” and shows her none of his own. And so it is apparent, that the שולחן ‘the table,’ is not to be understood for a common or ordinary table, in every man’s house, but the table of this trade; *τράπεζα κολλυβιστῶν*, as the evangelists call it, ‘The table of the money-changers.’

Now, it is hard to tell, what was the mystery of this trade, whether change or brokage: it is generally held, that they

^y In Augusto, cap. 4.

^z Cap. 3.

sat there to change great money into lesser coin, with some profit upon the change; and so the words, *κολλυβιστής* and *κέρμα*, do more properly intimate: for *κόλλυβος* is rendered by the Greek etymologists to be *ἀργυρίου ἀλλαγή*, ‘change of money,’ and *κολλυβιστής*, *ἀργυριαμοιβός*, ‘a money-changer;’ *κέρμα* doth properly signify ‘small money,’—*λεπτότατόν τι*, ‘of the smallest value.’

Camerarius, out of a nameless Greek author, gives this account of this matter; *ἡ λίτρα ἔχει οὐγγίας ιβʹ*, “A pound containeth twelve ounces: but the Hebrews, dividing the ounce, have called it by other names. For half an ounce they call ‘a stater,’ because, half an ounce being put in either scale, the scales stood even. Now a stater, or the half ounce, containeth two shekels; and the shekel, which is half the stater, and the fourth part of an ounce,—contained twenty lepta, which some call oboli, or half-pence. Now, one gave two half-pence, and received for it bread, or some other thing for food. Therefore, there sat in the temple at Jerusalem money-changers, which are called ‘Collybistæ,’ which changed the silver coin, that was stamped with the emperor’s picture, into less money. For whereas that coin [it was called ‘argenteus’] contained a hundred pence, and this was too high a rate for the buying of bread, pot-herbs, and such-like things,—it was brought to the money-changers, and they gave less coin for it,—namely, pence and half-pence, and the like.”

Ver. 15: “And when he had made a scourge of small cords,” &c.] This action of our Saviour, at his first appearing in his own temple, did fulfil that prophecy of Malachi^a; “The Lord whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple: but who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand, when he appeareth? for he is like refiner’s fire, and like fuller’s soap. And he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver, and he shall purify the sons of Levi,” &c.

There was an officer, that used to walk up and down this court, and the others, to see that every one stood to his charge, and did his duty. He was called *אִישׁ הַר בֵּית* ‘The man of the mountain of the house.’ “He went about from ward to ward, and candles lighted before him; and whosoever any man stood not upon his charge, the man of the mountain of the house said, ‘Peace be upon thee;’ and if

^a Chap. iii. 1—3.

it proved that he was asleep, he struck him with his rod : and he had authority to set fire on his coat : and they said, ‘What noise is that in the court?’ ‘Why, it is the noise of a son of Levi that is beaten, and his clothes burnt, because he was asleep upon his guard^b.’ ”

A greater than this man, nay, a greater than the temple itself, is now come ; and Christ, by this passage, doth not only show his zeal most divine and fervent, but he acteth in the authority of a prophet, and as one come from God : and so the Jews understand that he took upon him to do, when they propose to him, as for the trial of a prophet, that he would show a sign, and work a miracle. The cords of which he maketh his whip, it is like he found lying up and down the floor, which had tied some sacrifices, or some other things, and, after that use of them, were cast there. Now, he useth a whip rather than a staff, because there were no staves brought into the temple. “A man may not come into the mountain of the house with his staff, nor with his shoes,—with his purse, nor with the dust upon his feet^c.”

Our Saviour seemeth to allude to this, when he bids his disciples, as they go to preach, “To take neither staves, nor shoes, nor gold, nor silver, nor brass, in their purses,” and to shake off the dust of their feet^d. ‘No money in their girdles ;’ אזור חלול שמשמים בו המעת עוברי דרכים Gloss. “A hollow girdle, in which travellers put their money.” Compare this zealous action of our Saviour, with Neh. xiii. 25.

Ver. 16: “My Father’s house.”] He useth the same phrase in the same place,—viz. in the temple,—when he was found there among the doctors at twelve years old: “Why sought you me? know you not where to find me? know you not that I must be in my Father’s house^e?”

And he cometh off thus openly and plainly with the Jews, as to call God, his ‘Father,’—1. To assert himself for the Messiah, and to distinguish him from other prophets, who, at the utmost, could but call God, ‘my God.’ “There is no peace to the wicked, saith *my God*^f.” But he can, and doth, call him ‘Father :’ and doth so from his first appearing here in public, that he might reveal himself to the full, and leave the obstinate without excuse. 2. He seemeth to have special respect to that passage, 2 Sam. vii. 12, 13 ; where

^b Massecheth Middoth, cap. 1.

^d Matt. x. 9, 10.

^c Massecheth Beracoth, cap. 9.

^e Luke, ii. 49.

^f Isa. lvii. 21.

when God is promising to David, Christ to sit upon his throne for ever, and Solomon to sit upon his throne for a while; he saith, "He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever: I will be his *Father*."

Ver. 18: "What sign showest thou?"] The power of miracles had never been seen in the land, since their return out of captivity,—nay, nor the spirit of prophecy, since the death of Zechariah and Malachi, by their own authors' confession; and, therefore, the restoring of miracles and prophecy, was as 'the opening of heaven, and angels ascending and descending.' When they were ready to depart into Babylon, Habakkuk prayed, that God would keep alive his work of the power of miracles in that 'midst of years,' while they were in Babylon, and that they might not lose it, now they went into a strange land. And there he continued it among them in the hands of 'the three children,' as they are called, but more especially, in the hands of Daniel: Daniel's tying up the mouths of the lions, was the last miracle that had been done by man, till water was turned into wine at Cana in Galilee. They had prophets, indeed, came with them out of their captivity; and these saw visions, and had strange things done to them by God; but none, ever since they came up till now, had done any miracles or strange things from God. And after that first generation after their return, their prophets were ceased and gone, and they had no more: בְּחַגִּי זִכְרִיָּה וּמְלָאכִי פִסְקָה נְבוּאָה "In Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, prophecy ceased^s." And, therefore, besides the constant unbelief of the Jew, that would be still requiring a sign,—it is no wonder if they demand one of one, that now appeared and acted under the notion of a prophet, when signs and prophets had been so long strangers amongst them. Nor was this all that strained this question from them; but it is like that his calling God, in such singularity, 'his Father,' did move them to demand something from him as from a singular man, which thing might be suitable to such a relation as he owned. In John, v. 17, they are ready to fly in his face, because he calleth God 'his Father;' for there was 'scandalum acceptum,' 'an offence taken' at him, though none was given: they were moved at him, for that he had broken the sabbath, as they interpret it; and then they are

^s D. Kimch. on Zech. v.

ready to catch at every word, that fell from him, for they had entertained prejudice against him :—but as yet, he hath done here nothing, that should cause them to be offended ; the driving of the market out of the temple was a thing so reasonable, and so religious, that they could not open their mouth against it : and his calling of God his ‘ Father,’ is yet without offence, if he can answer both his action and his word, by doing something agreeable to them.

Ver. 19 : “ Destroy this temple.”] 1. Christ giveth them not a sign, otherwise than by telling them of that great sign, that he should once show, which would ‘ mightily declare him to be the Son of God ;’ and that is, the raising of his body from the dead : which very thing he also meaneth, though somewhat more be included in it, when he giveth them afterward the sign of Jonas^b. He did many miracles instantly at Jerusalem, as is apparent, ver. 23 ; yet would he not do one miracle for the satisfaction of this the Jews’ curiosity and query ; partly, because he would first give them some word of doctrine ; and partly, because, for his showing of miracles, he would take his own time and moving, and not theirs. In all the gospel, Christ doth no miracle, where some necessity went not along with it.

2. In these words, “ destroy this temple,” he commandeth them not to do the thing, but he foretelleth that they should do it ; as Isa. viii. 9, 10, John xiii. 27, &c, yield examples of the like nature ; “ Associate yourselves, and ye shall be broken in pieces ; take counsel together, and it shall come to nought.” And, “ what thou doest, do quickly,” &c.

3. His answer is very suitable to the present occasion : for as he had purged the temple, which they had defiled, for which they question his authority,—so saith he, “ Go yet farther, and even destroy this temple ; and, in three days, I will raise it.”

4. “ But he spake of the temple of his body,” ver. 21. Now, he used not any such gesture or action, as it seemeth, as that the Jews could perceive that he spake in that sense ; but they make a double misconstruction of his words ; namely, ignorant and wilful : ignorant, conceiving that he spake of the very material temple ;—wilful, in that, whereas he only saith, ‘ do you destroy it,’ they accuse him for saying, that he would destroy it himselfⁱ.

^b Matt. xii. 39.ⁱ Matt. xxvi. 61.

5. Now he speaketh so closely to them, and to the matter or occasion before them, partly, because of the nearness of relation that is between the thing signifying, and the thing signified, as Matt. xxvi. 26; and partly, because he would speak to them in parables and dark things, as Matt. xiii. 34, 35.

§ “This temple.”] Meaning the temple of his body, as the evangelist himself explaineth it; which may be understood, either because his body was the temple of the Godheadⁱ, or because it was represented by the material temple, in which God dwelt presentially, as the Godhead did in Christ bodily. The temple was a glorious figure of Christ, in God’s dwelling there amongst men; in giving his oracles there; in the services tendered and accepted there, &c. And therefore it was, that, wheresoever the Jews were in any part of the world, they were, in all their prayers, to turn their faces towards the temple^j. And thereupon it was, that, when the Jews destroyed Christ’s body, the temple rent from the top to the bottom, in one of the choicest parts of it.

Ver. 20: “Forty-and-six years was this temple in building.”] Although all that space of time and state of the Jews, that passed betwixt the return out of Babylon and the destruction of Jerusalem, be, generally, and indeed properly, said to be under ‘the second temple,’—yet, in exact strictness and reality, there were two temples in that space; namely, that, that was built by Zorobabel,—and that, that was built by Herod. Of the former, we have the relation in Ezra iii, and vi: of the latter, we have the story in Joseph. Antiq. lib. 15. cap. 14. Expositors upon this place take no notice of this duplicity, because they account that Herod did not build, but only repair, the temple: and they generally understand this forty-six years’ building, of the time and space that the temple was getting up in the days of Zorobabel, or instantly after the return from the Babylonian captivity: the parcels of which sum, every several expositor almost doth cast and reckon up by several counters. It were endless to allege, much more endless to examine, them. I shall spare that labour, since I have given my thoughts, concerning the reigns of the Persian kings of those times in another place; and I cannot but hold still unto that account, as conceiving it to

ⁱ Col. ii. 9.

^j 1 Kings, viii. 38. 42. 44. 48. Dan. vi. 10.

be the very account of Scripture : namely, that Cyrus reigned three years, Artaxerxes Ahasuerus after him fourteen years, and Artaxerxes Darius thirty-two years ; when Nehemiah went back to him, having finished Jerusalem street and wall : forty-nine years in all, or seven weeks, as Dan. ix. 25. Out of these forty-nine years, if you seclude the two first of Cyrus [for in his second, the temple was begun], and the thirty-second of Darius, as years only current,—you have exactly forty-six complete years, from the beginning of the founding of Zorobabel's temple, to the finishing of the city, and completing of the buildings and service-disposal of the temple with it.

And reckoning also after such a manner of reckoning, namely, by casting out years that were only current,—it was exactly forty-six complete years, since Herod began the building of the temple, to this very time that Christ and the Jews have this discourse. For Herod fell upon that work in the eighteenth year of his reign, as Josephus relateth in the place fore-cited ; and he reigned thirty-seven years, even till Christ was two years old, as we have proved in the first part of the Harmony, at sect. vii, or Matt. ii. And Christ, at this time of his discourse, was in the thirtieth year of his age, or just twenty-nine years old and a half. All which sums, if the reader cast up, and count as we did in the account before, he will find how fitly [if one will so take it] these words may be applied to the temple of Herod,—“ forty-and-six years hath this temple been built.”

Ver. 22: “ They believed the Scripture,” &c.] Whatsoever the Scriptures had spoken of Christ's death and resurrection, the disciples are said here to have believed, after his resurrection. But did they not believe them before ? It is undoubted they did, with a general historical belief ; but, after the resurrection, they made use of those texts and words, with a more special and peculiar application and experience.

Ver. 23: “ Now, when he was in Jerusalem, at the Pass-over,” &c.] It was the custom of the nation to come to Jerusalem some space of time before the festival, that they might purify themselves against the festival came. Now Christ, in this space, was purifying the temple, by casting out buyers and sellers, and driving out the cattle : and, when he was then asked for a miracle, he would do none ; but when

the feast was come, he beginneth to work miracles abundantly; and many believed on him. Now beginneth he most plainly and publicly to show himself, being now in the chief city, in the general concourse of all the nation, and in the greatest solemnity of all the year.

Ver. 24: "But Jesus did not commit himself unto them." [Some understand this, of his not committing and imparting the whole and full doctrine of the gospel to them: but the very carriage of the text sheweth, that it is to be understood of not trusting his person with them, because he knew their heart, and saw that there was mischief and rottenness in some of them against him.]

**** A general Index, adapted to 'The Harmony of the Four Evangelists,' is subjoined to the Third Part of the Harmony, in vol. v.**

END OF VOL. IV.

Bayerische
Staatsbibliothek
München

Printed by J. F. Dove, St. John's Square.

The first part of the book is devoted to a general history of the world, from the beginning of time to the present day. It is written in a simple and easy style, and is intended for the use of schools and families. The second part of the book is devoted to a history of the British Empire, from the reign of Henry II. to the present day. It is written in a more detailed and interesting style, and is intended for the use of those who wish to know more of the history of their country. The third part of the book is devoted to a history of the world, from the reign of Henry II. to the present day. It is written in a more detailed and interesting style, and is intended for the use of those who wish to know more of the history of the world.

The fourth part of the book is devoted to a history of the world, from the reign of Henry II. to the present day. It is written in a more detailed and interesting style, and is intended for the use of those who wish to know more of the history of the world.

The fifth part of the book is devoted to a history of the world, from the reign of Henry II. to the present day. It is written in a more detailed and interesting style, and is intended for the use of those who wish to know more of the history of the world.

The sixth part of the book is devoted to a history of the world, from the reign of Henry II. to the present day. It is written in a more detailed and interesting style, and is intended for the use of those who wish to know more of the history of the world.

The seventh part of the book is devoted to a history of the world, from the reign of Henry II. to the present day. It is written in a more detailed and interesting style, and is intended for the use of those who wish to know more of the history of the world.

The eighth part of the book is devoted to a history of the world, from the reign of Henry II. to the present day. It is written in a more detailed and interesting style, and is intended for the use of those who wish to know more of the history of the world.

The ninth part of the book is devoted to a history of the world, from the reign of Henry II. to the present day. It is written in a more detailed and interesting style, and is intended for the use of those who wish to know more of the history of the world.

Lightfoot, John,

The whole works of the Rev. John Lightfoot

Bd.: 4

London 1822

Th.u. 227 h-4

urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10785930-5